



Modern Militiaman



A Journal of the Modern Resistance Movement

Issue #3, October 1996

Purpose and Dedication: This electronic and limited print newsletter is dedicated to the modern militiamen and women of the American Resistance Movement. The writers, editors, and contributors of this newsletter have by their talents become leading actors within the overall Patriot movement, be they militiamen, common-law jurists, tax-protesters, Freemen, shortwave talk-show hosts, Libertarians, Conspiracy Theorists or other assorted Rebels with a cause. We are an unruly bunch.

Most of the feeds and articles to this newsletter come off the Internet or electronic mail, which is the Gutenberg device of choice. Far-flung, quick, cheap, and secure, the Internet is a growing web of information which cannot be stopped or effectively censored. While at least one copy of each issue will be printed in order to take advantage of 1st Amendment press protections, thus blanketing the electronic edition, this and every issue is designed to be pulled apart and redesigned for every region, for every portion of the former Sweet Land of Liberty, to be used by Patriots everywhere. The opinions expressed in this newsletter are the opinions only of the authors, nobody else. The result should be freedom, not peace.

This is the third issue. I have the honor to be the editor of it. Hopefully, there will be other issues, other editors, and new writers as the old ones are locked up, shot, run-off, Arkancided, or bored to death -- anything other than complacent. Now let's go out and raise some hell and have some fun.

Editor Martin Lindstedt

Copyright 1996. Anyone is at liberty to copy this newsletter in whole or in part for non-profit purposes provided they properly attribute copied portions to *Modern Militiaman* and the author(s). People who do make a buck from it are expected to pony up.

Table of Contents:

[1. About This Issue](#) -- Martin Lindstedt, Managing Editor

[2. No Treason #6, The Constitution of No Effect](#) --Lysander Spooner

- [3. Leaderless Resistance -- An Essay](#) by L. R. Beam
 - [5. Agents Provocateur are Helpful to the Cause](#) -- Jeff Randall
 - [6. The Militia](#) -- J.J. Johnson
 - [7. Randall's Rules of War with the Kemp Corollaries](#)
 - [8. The Roadblock](#) -- Joseph Horn
 - [9. Clinton/Gore 96 Campaign -- Pro or Con](#)
 - [10. Guerrilla Political Warfare](#) -- Martin Lindstedt
 - [11. The Third Continental Congress](#)
- .
-
- .

About This Issue:

The purpose of Issue 3 is predominately political. War and politics are interrelated, according to Clausewitz, who wrote that *"War is regarded as nothing but the continuation of politics by other means."* As militiamen, we should understand politics, because Politics is the means by which the effective militiaman wages war minimizing the need for bloodshed. The end all and be all of Sun Tzu's wisdom said, *"Hence to fight and conquer in all your battles is not supreme excellence; supreme excellence consists in breaking the enemy's resistance without fighting."*

So let us understand the meaning of politics as presently practiced in Amerika. The first root of politics is "poly" which is Greek for many. And we all know the derivation of the second root of "tics." Ticks are blood-sucking parasites which weaken their host. So politics in Amerika, from the militiaman's point of view, should oriented towards scraping off the hordes of blood-sucking parasites without destroying the hosting body politic.

So the first article is towards dismantling in our affections that paper idol known as the Constitution. I start out with a classic essay, "No Treason #6 --The Constitution of No Effect," by Lysander Spooner, who pointed out in 1870 how nobody is bound by what a bunch of dead men working in their own interests thought was a good idea then in forming a central government of the sovereign states. This article had to be severely truncated to fit this issue. Lysander Spooner went on to condemn the NWO of his day, the Rothschilds, and the Civil War, and its combatants, particularly the North. The article in its entirety will be included in my WWW page.

In later issues, after this cold bath of reason, I will myself comment on how the Constitution has about as much relevance today in protecting your rights as a piece of government toilet paper. While I have read chest-thumping article after article galore from would-be Thomas Jeffersons and James Madisons concerning the godly need to "Restore the Constitution" or some other such rot, it is necessary to show how Patrick Henry and other deep thinkers knew the Constitution was nothing more than a piece of paper, never trusted it with the liberties of the people and why the Constitution should not be worshipped as a paper idol.

The second series of articles has to do with forming survivable militia organizations. Right now, like the entire country, the militia movement is marking time, holding its breath, and waiting for what the election will bring. This dormant phase is for the choosing of sides and through government predation of the weak foolish and unlucky of the Patriot Resistance movement will actually improve militia stock. Reprinted to make my point is the classic essay on "Leaderless Resistance" by Louis Beam. More recent articles are from militia leaders in the field commenting on the new reality. Jeff Randall, in his militant stream-of-consciousness article "West Virginia Wannabes" explains what he finds weak in the militia movement. The eloquent JJ. Johnson in "The Militia" explains what he has learned in the past months or so about militia organization.

Then follows a number of articles as intermission for the purpose of inducing thought. Jeff Randall gives his Heinleinesque thoughts on warfare with corollaries by Mike Kemp. Joseph Horn makes us think with commentary on his experiences at a police roadblock.

Politics continues with a discussion of whether militia voters should re-elect the First Crook, as Jeff Randall proposes, infiltrate the Democrats and Republican Parties like Helen Johnson counters, or a mixture of both and neither, as I and others suggest.

An article on Guerrilla Politics and campaign tricks to be used by Resistance politicians follows.

Lastly, there is a topical announcement of a "Third" "Continental" "Congress" to be held in Independence, then Harrisonville, now Grandview, Missouri, October 29, 30, and 31 and what is known about its arrangements.

This Issue #3 of Modern Militiaman is huge, the end result of editing at the last minute. It will be offered in ACII text (*.txt), in Windows 3.1 Write (*.wri), in WinWord 6.0 (*.doc), and in Internet HTML (*.html) format. Default extension will be via ASCII text file attachment. For Write, Word, or HTML formats, e-mail me with a request for your format] and I will send it as an attachment to you.

Patricia Neill will be Roving Editor of Modern Militiaman, Issue #4.

[--Martin Lindstedt](#), Managing Editor

Lysander Spooner

No Treason # VI: The Constitution of No Authority

[1870]

The Constitution has no inherent authority or obligation. It has no authority or obligation at all, unless as a contract between man and man. And it does not so much as even purport to be a contract between persons now existing. It purports, at most, to be only a contract between persons living eighty years ago. And it can be supposed to have been a contract then only between persons who had already come to years of discretion, so as to be competent to make reasonable and obligatory contracts. Furthermore, we know, historically, that only a small portion even of the people then existing were consulted on the subject, or asked, or permitted to express either their consent or dissent in any formal manner. Those persons, if any, who did give their consent formally, are all dead now. Most of them have been dead forty, fifty, sixty, or seventy years. and the Constitution, so far as it was their contract, died with them. They had no natural power or right to make it obligatory upon their children. It is not only plainly impossible, in the nature of things, that they could bind their posterity, but they did not even attempt to bind them. That is to say, the instrument does not purport to be an agreement between any body but "the people" then existing; nor does it, either expressly or impliedly, assert any right, power, or disposition, on their part, to bind anybody but themselves. Let us see. Its language is:

We, the people of the United States (that is, the people then existing in the United States), in order to form a more perfect union, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.

It is plain, in the first place, that this language, as an agreement, purports to be only what it at most really was, viz., a contract between the people then existing; and, of necessity, binding, as a contract, only upon those then existing. In the second place, the language neither expresses nor implies that they had any right or power, to bind their "posterity" to live under it. It does not say that their "posterity" will, shall, or must live under it. It only

says, in effect, that their hopes and motives in adopting it were that it might prove useful to their posterity, as well as to themselves, by promoting their union, safety, tranquility, liberty, etc.

Suppose an agreement were entered into, in this form:

We, the people of Boston, agree to maintain a fort on Governor's Island, to protect ourselves and our posterity against invasion.

This agreement, as an agreement, would clearly bind nobody but the people then existing. Secondly, it would assert no right, power, or disposition, on their part, to compel their "posterity" to maintain such a fort. It would only indicate that the supposed welfare of their posterity was one of the motives that induced the original parties to enter into the agreement.

... So when a man says he is planting a tree for himself and his posterity, he does not mean to be understood as saying that he has any thought of compelling them, nor is it to be inferred that he is such a simpleton as to imagine that he has any right or power to compel them, to eat the fruit. So far as they are concerned, he only means to say that his hopes and motives, in planting the tree, are that its fruit may be agreeable to them.

So it was with those who originally adopted the Constitution. Whatever may have been their personal intentions, the legal meaning of their language, so far as their "posterity" was concerned, simply was, that their hopes and motives, in entering into the agreement, were that it might prove useful and acceptable to their posterity; that it might promote their union, safety, tranquility, and welfare; and that it might tend "to secure to them the blessings of liberty." The language does not assert nor at all imply, any right, power, or disposition, on the part of the original parties to the agreement, to compel their "posterity" to live under it. If they had intended to bind their posterity to live under it, they should have said that their objective was, not "to secure to them the blessings of liberty," but to make slaves of them; for if their "posterity" are bound to live under it, they are nothing less than the slaves of their foolish, tyrannical, and dead grandfathers.

It cannot be said that the Constitution formed "the people of the United States," for all time, into a corporation. It does not speak of "the people" as a corporation, but as individuals. A corporation does not describe itself as "we," nor as "people," nor as "ourselves." Nor does a corporation, in legal language, have any "posterity." It supposes itself to have, and speaks of itself as having, perpetual existence, as a single individuality.

Moreover, no body of men, existing at any one time, have the power to create a perpetual corporation. A corporation can become practically perpetual only by the voluntary accession of new members, as the old ones die off. But for this voluntary accession of new members, the corporation necessarily dies with the death of those who originally composed it.

... If, then, those who established the Constitution, had no power to bind, and did not attempt to bind, their posterity, the question arises, whether their posterity have bound themselves. If they have done so, they can have done so in only one or both of these two ways, viz., by voting, and paying taxes.

II.

Let us consider these two matters, voting and tax paying, separately. And first of voting.

All the voting that has ever taken place under the Constitution, has been of such a kind that it not only did not pledge the whole people to support the Constitution, but it did not even pledge any one of them to do so, as the following considerations show.

1. In the very nature of things, the act of voting could bind nobody but the actual voters. But owing to the property qualifications required, it is probable that, during the first twenty or thirty years under the Constitution, not more than one-tenth, fifteenth, or perhaps twentieth of the whole population (black and white, men, women,

and minors) were permitted to vote. Consequently, so far as voting was concerned, not more than one-tenth, fifteenth, or twentieth of those then existing, could have incurred any obligation to support the Constitution.

At the present time [1870], it is probable that not more than one-sixth of the whole population are permitted to vote. Consequently, so far as voting is concerned, the other five-sixths can have given no pledge that they will support the Constitution.

2. Of the one-sixth that are permitted to vote, probably not more than two-thirds (about one-ninth of the whole population) have usually voted. Many never vote at all. Many vote only once in two, three, five, or ten years, in periods of great excitement.

No one, by voting, can be said to pledge himself for any longer period than that for which he votes. If, for example, I vote for an officer who is to hold his office for only a year, I cannot be said to have thereby pledged myself to support the government beyond that term. Therefore, on the ground of actual voting, it probably cannot be said that more than one-ninth or one-eighth, of the whole population are usually under any pledge to support the Constitution.

3. It cannot be said that, by voting, a man pledges himself to support the Constitution, unless the act of voting be a perfectly voluntary one on his part. Yet the act of voting cannot properly be called a voluntary one on the part of any very large number of those who do vote. It is rather a measure of necessity imposed upon them by others, than one of their own choice. On this point I repeat what was said in a former number, viz.:

In truth, in the case of individuals, their actual voting is not to be taken as proof of consent, even for the time being. On the contrary, it is to be considered that, without his consent having even been asked a man finds himself environed by a government that he cannot resist; a government that forces him to pay money, render service, and forego the exercise of many of his natural rights, under peril of weighty punishments. He sees, too, that other men practice this tyranny over him by the use of the ballot. He sees further, that, if he will but use the ballot himself, he has some chance of relieving himself from this tyranny of others, by subjecting them to his own. In short, he finds himself, without his consent, so situated that, if he use the ballot, he may become a master; if he does not use it, he must become a slave. And he has no other alternative than these two. In self-defense, he attempts the former. His case is analogous to that of a man who has been forced into battle, where he must either kill others, or be killed himself. Because, to save his own life in battle, a man takes the lives of his opponents, it is not to be inferred that the battle is one of his own choosing. Neither in contests with the ballot---which is a mere substitute for a bullet---because, as his only chance of self-preservation, a man uses a ballot, is it to be inferred that the contest is one into which he voluntarily entered; that he voluntarily set up all his own natural rights, as a stake against those of others, to be lost or won by the mere power of numbers. On the contrary, it is to be considered that, in an exigency into which he had been forced by others, and in which no other means of self-defense offered, he, as a matter of necessity, used the only one that was left to him.

...Therefore, a man's voting under the Constitution of the United States, is not to be taken as evidence that he ever freely assented to the Constitution, even for the time being. Consequently we have no proof that any very large portion, even of the actual voters of the United States, ever really and voluntarily consented to the Constitution, even for the time being. Nor can we ever have such proof, until every man is left perfectly free to consent, or not, without thereby subjecting himself or his property to be disturbed or injured by others.

...Legally speaking, therefore, the act of voting utterly fails to pledge any one to support the government. It utterly fails to prove that the government rests upon the voluntary support of anybody. On general principles of law and reason, it cannot be said that the government has any voluntary supporters at all, until it can be distinctly shown who its voluntary supporters are.

4. As taxation is made compulsory on all, whether they vote or not, a large proportion of those who vote, no doubt do so to prevent their own money being used against themselves; when, in fact, they would have gladly abstained from voting, if they could thereby have saved themselves from taxation alone, to say nothing of being saved from all the other usurpations and tyrannies of the government. To take a man's property without his consent, and then to infer his consent because he attempts, by voting, to prevent that property from being used to his injury, is a very insufficient proof of his consent to support the Constitution. It is, in fact, no proof at all. . . .

5. At nearly all elections, votes are given for various candidates for the same office. Those who vote for the unsuccessful candidates cannot properly be said to have voted to sustain the Constitution. They may, with more reason, be supposed to have voted, not to support the Constitution, but specially to prevent the tyranny which they anticipate the successful candidate intends to practice upon them under color of the Constitution; and therefore may reasonably be supposed to have voted against the Constitution itself. . . .

6. Many votes are usually given for candidates who have no prospect of success. Those who give such votes may reasonably be supposed to have voted as they did, with a special intention, not to support, but to obstruct the execution of, the Constitution; and, therefore, against the Constitution itself.

7. As all the different votes are given secretly (by secret ballot), there is no legal means of knowing, from the votes themselves, who votes for, and who votes against, the Constitution. Therefore, voting affords no legal evidence that any particular individual supports the Constitution. And where there can be no legal evidence that any particular individual supports the Constitution, it cannot legally be said that anybody supports it. . . .

8. There being no legal proof of any man's intentions, in voting, we can only conjecture them. As a conjecture, it is probable, that a very large proportion of those who vote, do so on this principle, viz., that if, by voting, they could but get the government into their own hands (or that of their friends), and use its powers against their opponents, they would then willingly support the Constitution; but if their opponents are to have the power, and use it against them, then they would not willingly support the Constitution.

In short, men's voluntary support of the Constitution is doubtless, in most cases, wholly contingent upon the question whether, by means of the Constitution, they can make themselves masters, or are to be made slaves.

Such contingent consent as that is, in law and reason, no consent at all.

9. As everybody who supports the Constitution by voting (if there are any such) does so secretly (by secret ballot), and in a way to avoid all personal responsibility for the acts of his agents or representatives, it cannot legally or reasonably be said that anybody at all supports the Constitution by voting. . .

10. As all voting is secret (by secret ballot), and as all secret governments are necessarily only secret bands of robbers, tyrants, and murderers, the general fact that our government is practically carried on by means of such voting, only proves that there is among us a secret band of robbers, tyrants, and murderers, whose purpose is to rob, enslave, and, so far as necessary to accomplish their purposes, murder, the rest of the people. The simple fact of the existence of such a band does nothing towards proving that "the people of the United States," or any one of them, voluntarily supports the Constitution.

For all the reasons that have now been given, voting furnishes no legal evidence as to who the particular individuals are (if there are any), who voluntarily support the Constitution. It therefore furnishes no legal evidence that anybody supports it voluntarily.

So far, therefore, as voting is concerned, the Constitution, legally speaking, has no supporters at all.

And, as a matter of fact, there is not the slightest probability that the Constitution has a single bona fide supporter in the country. That is to say, there is not the slightest probability that there is a single man in the country, who both understands what the Constitution really is, and sincerely supports it for what it really is.

The ostensible supporters of the Constitution, like the ostensible supporters of most other governments, are made up of three classes, viz.:

1. Knaves, a numerous and active class, who see in the government an instrument which they can use for their own aggrandizement or wealth.
2. Dupes---a large class, no doubt---each of whom, because he is allowed one voice out of millions in deciding what he may do with his own person and his own property, and because he is permitted to have the same voice in robbing, enslaving, and murdering others, that others have in robbing, enslaving, and murdering himself, is stupid enough to imagine that he is a "free man," a "sovereign"; that this is "a free government"; "a government of equal rights," "the best government on earth," and such like absurdities. (Suppose it be "the best government on earth," does that prove its own goodness, or only the badness of all other governments?)
3. A class who have some appreciation of the evils of government, but either do not see how to get rid of them, or do not choose to so far sacrifice their private interests as to give themselves seriously and earnestly to the work of making a change.

III.

The payment of taxes, being compulsory, of course furnishes no evidence that any one voluntarily supports the Constitution.

1. It is true that the theory of our Constitution is, that all taxes are paid voluntarily; that our government is a mutual insurance company, voluntarily entered into by the people with each other; that each man makes a free and purely voluntary contract with all others who are parties to the Constitution, to pay so much money for so much protection, . . . and that he is just as free not to be protected, and not to pay tax, as he is to pay a tax, and be protected.

But this theory of our government is wholly different from the practical fact. The fact is that the government, like a highwayman, says to a man: "Your money, or your life." And many, if not most, taxes are paid under the compulsion of that threat. . . .

The highwayman takes solely upon himself the responsibility, danger, and crime of his own act. He does not pretend that he has any rightful claim to your money, or that he intends to use it for your own benefit. He does not pretend to be anything but a robber. . . . In short, he does not, in addition to robbing you, attempt to make you either his dupe or his slave.

The proceedings of those robbers and murderers, who call themselves "the government," are directly the opposite of these of the single highwayman. . . .

In the first place, they do not, like him, make themselves individually known; or, consequently, take upon themselves personally the responsibility of their acts.

. . . It is under such compulsion as this that taxes, so called, are paid. And how much proof the payment of taxes affords, that the people consent to "support the government," it needs no further argument to show.

2. Still another reason why the payment of taxes implies no consent, or pledge, to support the government, is that the taxpayer does not know, and has no means of knowing, who the particular individuals are who compose "the government." To him "the government" is a myth, an abstraction, an incorporeality, with which he can make no contract, and to which he can give no consent, and make no pledge. He knows it only through its pretended agents. . . .

3. Not knowing who the particular individuals are, who call themselves "the government," the taxpayer does not know whom he pays his taxes to. All he knows is that a man comes to him, representing himself to be the agent of "the government . . . To save his life, he gives up his money to this agent. . . .To say, therefore, that by giving up his money to their agent, he entered into a voluntary contract with them, that he pledges himself to obey them, to support them, and to give them whatever money they should demand of him in the future, is simply ridiculous.

4. All political power, so called, rests practically upon this matter of money. Any number of scoundrels, having money enough to start with, can establish themselves as a "government"; because, with money, they can hire soldiers, and with soldiers extort more money; and also compel general obedience to their will. . . . And, when their authority is denied, the first use they always make of money, is to hire soldiers to kill or subdue all who refuse them more money.. . . .

. . . It is perfectly evident, therefore, that neither such voting, nor such payment of taxes, as actually takes place, proves anybody's consent, or obligation, to support the Constitution. Consequently we have no evidence at all that the Constitution is binding upon anybody, or that anybody is under any contract or obligation whatever to support it. And nobody is under any obligation to support it.

IV.

The Constitution not only binds nobody now, but it never did bind anybody. It never bound anybody, because it was never agreed to by anybody in such a manner as to make it, on general principles of law and reason, binding upon him.

It is a general principle of law and reason, that a written instrument binds no one until he has signed it. . . .

. . . Where would be the end of fraud and litigation, if one party could bring into court a written instrument, without any signature, and claim to have it enforced, upon the ground that it was written for another man to sign? That this other man had promised to sign it? That he ought to have signed it? That he had had the opportunity to sign it, if he would? But that he had refused or neglected to do so? Yet that is the most that could ever be said of the Constitution. . . .

. . . The very men who drafted it, never signed it in any way to bind themselves by it, as a contract. And not one of them probably ever would have signed it in any way to bind himself by it, as a contract. . . .

The Constitution was not only never signed by anybody, but it was never delivered by anybody, or to anybody's agent or attorney. It can therefore be of no more validity as a contract, then can any other instrument that was never signed or delivered. . . .

VI.

It is no exaggeration, but a literal truth, to say that, by the Constitution---not as I interpret it, but as it is interpreted by those who pretend to administer it---the properties, liberties, and lives of the entire people of the United States are surrendered unreservedly into the hands of men who, it is provided by the Constitution itself, shall never be "questioned" as to any disposal they make of them.

Thus the Constitution (Art. I, Sec. 6) provides that, "for any speech or debate (or vote), in either house, they (the senators and representatives) shall not be questioned in any other place.". . . and this provision protects them from all responsibility for the laws they make. . . .

. . . Thus the whole power of the government is in their hands, and they are made utterly irresponsible for the use they make of it. What is this but absolute, irresponsible power?

It is no answer to this view of the case to say that these men are under oath to use their power only within certain limits; for what care they, or what should they care, for oaths or limits, when it is expressly provided, by the Constitution itself, that they shall never be "questioned," or held to any responsibility whatever, for violating their oaths, or transgressing those limits?

Neither is it any answer to this view of the case to say that the men holding this absolute, irresponsible power, must be men chosen by the people (or portions of them) to hold it. A man is none the less a slave because he is allowed to choose a new master once in a term of years. Neither are a people any the less slaves because permitted periodically to choose new masters. . . .

The right of absolute and irresponsible dominion is the right of property, and the right of property is the right of absolute, irresponsible dominion. ... If they own us as property, they are our masters, and their will is our law. If they do not own us as property, they are not our masters, and their will, as such, is of no authority over us.

But these men who claim and exercise this absolute and irresponsible dominion over us, dare not be consistent, and claim either to be our masters, or to own us as property. They say they are only our servants, agents, attorneys, and representatives. But this declaration involves an absurdity, a contradiction. No man can be my servant, agent, attorney, or representative, and be, at the same time, uncontrollable by me, and irresponsible to me for his acts. . . .

For still another reason they are neither our servants, agents, attorneys, nor representatives. And that reason is, that we do not make ourselves responsible for their acts. . . . But no individual who may be injured in his person or property, by acts of Congress, can come to the individual electors, and hold them responsible for these acts of their so-called agents or representatives. This fact proves that these pretended agents of the people, of everybody, are really the agents of nobody.

If, then, nobody is individually responsible for the acts of Congress, the members of Congress are nobody's agents. And if they are nobody's agents, they are themselves individually responsible for their own acts, and for the acts of all whom they employ. . . .

VII.

It is plain, then, that on general principles of law and reason--- such principles as we all act upon in courts of justice and in common life---the Constitution is no contract; that it binds nobody, and never did bind anybody; and that all those who pretend to act by its authority, are really acting without any legitimate authority at all; that, on general principles of law and reason, they are mere usurpers, and that everybody not only has the right, but is morally bound, to treat them as such.

If the people of this country wish to maintain such a government as the Constitution describes, there is no reason in the world why they should not sign the instrument itself, and thus make known their wishes in an open, authentic manner; . . . and in such manner as to make themselves (as they ought to do) individually responsible for the acts of the government. But the people have never been asked to sign it. And the only reason why they have never been asked to sign it, has been that it has been known that they never would sign it; . . . It is, to all moral intents and purposes, as destitute of obligations as the compacts which robbers and thieves and pirates enter into with each other, but never sign. . . .

VIII.

The Constitution itself, then, being of no authority, on what authority does our government practically rest? On what ground can those who pretend to administer it, claim the right to seize men's property, to restrain them of their natural liberty of action, industry, and trade, and to kill all who deny their authority to dispose of men's properties, liberties, and lives at their pleasure or discretion?

The most they can say, in answer to this question, is, that some half, two-thirds, or three-fourths, of the male adults of the country have a tacit understanding that they will maintain a government under the Constitution; that they will select, by ballot, the persons to administer it; and that those persons who may receive a majority, or a plurality, of their ballots, shall act as their representatives, and administer the Constitution in their name, and by their authority.

But this tacit understanding (admitting it to exist) cannot at all justify the conclusion drawn from it. A tacit understanding between A, B, and C, that they will, by ballot, depute D as their agent, to deprive me of my property, liberty, or life, cannot at all authorize D to do so. He is none the less a robber, tyrant, and murderer, because he claims to act as their agent, than he would be if he avowedly acted on his own responsibility alone.. . .

This tacit understanding, therefore, among the voters of the country, amounts to nothing as an authority to their agents. Neither do the ballots by which they select their agents, avail any more than does their tacit understanding; for their ballots are given in secret, and therefore in such a way as to avoid any personal responsibility for the acts of their agents. . . .

But even these pretended agents do not themselves know who their pretended principals are. These latter act in secret; for acting by secret ballot is acting in secret as much as if they were to meet in secret conclave in the darkness of the night. And they are personally as much unknown to the agents they select, as they are to others. . .

The secret ballot makes a secret government; and a secret government is a secret band of robbers and murderers. Open despotism is better than this. The single despot stands out in the face of all men, and says: I am the State: My will is law: I am your master: I take the responsibility of my acts: The only arbiter I acknowledge is the sword: If anyone denies my right, let him try conclusions with me.

But a secret government is little less than a government of assassins. Under it, a man knows not who his tyrants are, until they have struck, and perhaps not then. He may guess, beforehand, as to some of his immediate neighbors. But he really knows nothing. The man to whom he would most naturally fly for protection, may prove an enemy, when the time of trial comes.

This is the kind of government we have; and it is the only one we are likely to have, until men are ready to say: We will consent to no Constitution, except such an one as we are neither ashamed nor afraid to sign; and we will authorize no government to do anything in our name which we are not willing to be personally responsible for.

IX.

What is the motive to the secret ballot? This, and only this: Like other confederates in crime, those who use it are not friends, but enemies; and they are afraid to be known, and to have their individual doings known, even to each other. They can contrive to bring about a sufficient understanding to enable them to act in concert against other persons; but beyond this they have no confidence, and no friendship, among themselves. In fact, they are engaged quite as much in schemes for plundering each other, as in plundering those who are not of them. . . . And this is avowedly the only reason for the ballot: for a secret government; a government by secret bands of robbers and murderers. And we are insane enough to call this liberty! To be a member of this secret band of robbers and murderers is esteemed a privilege and an honor! . . .

If any number of men, many or few, claim the right to govern the people of this country, let them make and sign an open compact with each other to do so. Let them thus make themselves individually known to those whom they propose to govern. And let them thus openly take the legitimate responsibility of their acts. How many of those who now support the Constitution, will ever do this? How many will ever dare openly proclaim their right to govern? or take the legitimate responsibility of their acts? Not one!

XI.

On general principles of law and reason, the oaths which these pretended agents of the people take "to support the Constitution," are of no validity or obligation. And why? For this, if for no other reason, viz., that they are given to nobody. There is no privity (as the lawyers say)---that is, no mutual recognition, consent, and agreement---between those who take these oaths, and any other persons.

... For these reasons the oaths taken by members of Congress, "to support the Constitution," are, on general principles of law and reason, of no validity. They are not only criminal in themselves, and therefore void; but they are also void for the further reason that they are given to nobody.

It cannot be said that, in any legitimate or legal sense, they are given to "the people of the United States"; because neither the whole, nor any large proportion of the whole, people of the United States ever, either openly or secretly, appointed or designated these men as their agents to carry the Constitution into effect. The great body of the people---that is, men, women, and children---were never asked, or even permitted, to signify, in any formal manner, either openly or secretly, their choice or wish on the subject. . . .

... The gross number of these secret votes, or what purports to be their gross number, in different localities, is occasionally published. Whether these reports are accurate or not, we have no means of knowing. It is generally supposed that great frauds are often committed in depositing them. They are understood to be received and counted by certain men, who are themselves appointed for that purpose by the same secret process by which all other officers and agents of the band are selected. . . .

... This is the most that any member of Congress can say in proof that he has any constituency; that he represents anybody; that his oath "to support the Constitution," is given to anybody, or pledges his faith to anybody. He has no open, written, or other authentic evidence, such as is required in all other cases, that he was ever appointed the agent or representative of anybody. He has no written power of attorney from any single individual.

Of course his oath, professedly given to them, "to support the Constitution," is, on general principles of law and reason, an oath given to nobody. It pledges his faith to nobody. If he fails to fulfill his oath, not a single person can come forward, and say to him, you have betrayed me, or broken faith with me.. . .

XII.

For the same reasons, the oaths of all the other pretended agents of this secret band of robbers and murderers are, on general principles of law and reason, equally destitute of obligation. They are given to nobody; but only to the winds. . . .

The oaths of the tax-gatherers and treasurers of the band, are, on general principles of law and reason, of no validity. If any tax gatherer, for example, should put the money he receives into his own pocket, and refuse to part with it, the members of this band could not say to him: You collected that money as our agent, and for our uses; and you swore to pay it over to us, or to those we should appoint to receive it. You have betrayed us, and broken faith with us. . . .

XIV

On general principles of law and reason, all the oaths which, since the war, have been given by Southern men, that they will obey the laws of Congress, support the Union, and the like, are of no validity. Such oaths are invalid, not only because they were extorted by military power, and threats of confiscation, and because they are in contravention of men's natural right to do as they please about supporting the government, but also because they were given to nobody. They were nominally given to "the United States." But being nominally given to "the United States," they were necessarily given to nobody, because, on general principles of law and reason, there

were no "United States," to whom the oaths could be given. That is to say, there was no open, authentic, avowed, legitimate association, corporation, or body of men, known as "the United States," or as "the people of the United States," to whom the oaths could have been given. If anybody says there was such a corporation, let him state who were the individuals that composed it, and how and when they became a corporation. Were Mr. A, Mr. B, and Mr. C members of it? If so, where are their signatures? Where the evidence of their membership? Where the record? Where the open, authentic proof? There is none. Therefore, in law and reason, there was no such corporation. . . .

XV.

On general principles of law and reason, the oaths of soldiers, that they will serve a given number of years, that they will obey the orders of their superior officers, that they will bear true allegiance to the government, and so forth, are of no obligation. Independently of the criminality of an oath, that, for a given number of years, he will kill all whom he may be commanded to kill, without exercising his own judgment or conscience as to the justice or necessity of such killing, there is this further reason why a soldier's oath is of no obligation, viz., that, like all the other oaths that have now been mentioned, it is given to nobody. . . .

APPENDIX.

Inasmuch as the Constitution was never signed, nor agreed to, by anybody, as a contract, and therefore never bound anybody, and is now binding upon nobody; and is, moreover, such an one as no people can ever hereafter be expected to consent to, except as they may be forced to do so at the point of the bayonet, it is perhaps of no importance what its true legal meaning, as a contract, is. Nevertheless, the writer thinks it proper to say that, in his opinion, the Constitution is no such instrument as it has generally been assumed to be; but that by false interpretations, and naked usurpations, the government has been made in practice a very widely, and almost wholly, different thing from what the Constitution itself purports to authorize. He has heretofore written much, and could write much more, to prove that such is the truth. But whether the Constitution really be one thing, or another, this much is certain---that it has either authorized such a government as we have had, or has been powerless to prevent it. In either case, it is unfit to exist.

.

.

Leaderless Resistance

An Essay by *L. R. Beam*

The concept of leaderless resistance was proposed by Col. Ulius Louis Amoss, who was the founder of International Service of Information Incorporated, located in Baltimore, Maryland. Col. Amoss died more than 15 years ago, but during his life he was a tireless opponent of Communism, as well as a skilled intelligence officer.

Col. Amoss first wrote of leaderless resistance on April 17, 1962. His theories of organization were primarily directed against the threat of eventual Communist takeover in the United States. The present writer, with the benefit of having lived many years beyond Col. Amoss, has taken his theories and expounded on them.

Col. Amoss feared the Communists. This author fears the federal government. Communism now represents a threat to no one in the United States, while federal tyranny represents a threat to EVERYONE. The writer has joyfully lived long enough to see the dying breaths of Communism, but may unhappily remain long enough to see the last dying gasps of freedom in America.

In the hope that, somehow, America can still produce the brave sons and daughters necessary to fight off ever-increasing persecution and oppression, this essay is offered. Frankly, it is too close to call at this point. Those who love liberty, and believe in freedom enough to fight for it, are rare today; but within the bosom of every once great nation, there remains secreted the pearls of former greatness.

They are there. I have looked into their sparkling eyes; sharing a brief moment in time with them as I passed through this life. Relished their friendship, endured their pain, and they mine. We are a band of brothers native to the soil, gaining strength one from another as we have rushed headlong into battle that all the weaker, timid men say we can not win. Perhaps not... but then again, perhaps we can. It's not over till the last freedom fighter is buried or imprisoned, or the same happens to those who would destroy their liberty.

Barring any cataclysmic events, the struggle will yet go on for years. The passage of time will make it clear to even the more slow among us that the government is the foremost threat to the life and liberty of the folk. The government will no doubt make today's oppressiveness look like grade school work compared to what they have planned in the future. Meanwhile, there are those of us who continue to hope that somehow the few can do what the many have not.

We are cognizant that before things get better they will certainly get worse as government shows a willingness to use ever more severe police state measures against dissidents. This changing situation makes it clear that those who oppose state repression must be prepared to alter, adapt, and modify their behavior, strategy, and tactics as circumstances warrant. Failure to consider new methods and implement them as necessary will make the government's efforts at suppression uncomplicated. It is the duty of every patriot to make the tyrant's life miserable. When one fails to do so he not only fails himself, but his people.

With this in mind, current methods of resistance to tyranny employed by those who love our race, culture, and heritage must pass a litmus test of soundness. Methods must be objectively measured as to their effectiveness, as well as to whether they make the government's intention of repression more possible or more difficult. Those not working to aid our objectives must be discarded, or the government benefits from our failure to do so.

As honest men who have banded together into groups or associations of a political or religious nature are falsely labeled "domestic terrorists" or "cultists" and suppressed, it will become necessary to consider other methods of organization, or as the case may very well call for: non- organization.

One should keep in mind that it is not in the government's interest to eliminate all groups. Some few must remain in order to perpetuate the smoke and mirrors for the masses that America is a "free democratic country" where dissent is allowed. Most organizations, however, that possess the potential for effective resistance will not be allowed to continue. Anyone who is so naive as to believe the most powerful government on earth will not crush any who pose a real threat to that power, should not be active, but rather at home studying political history.

The question as to who is to be left alone and who is not, will be answered by how groups and individuals deal with several factors such as: avoidance of conspiracy plots, rejection of feeble-minded malcontents, insistence upon quality of the participants, avoidance of all contact with the front men for the federals - the news media - and, finally, camouflage (which can be defined as the ability to blend in the public's eye the more committed groups of resistance with mainstream "kosher" associations that are generally seen as harmless).

Primarily though, whether any organization is allowed to continue in the future will be a matter of how big a threat a group represents. Not a threat in terms of armed might or political ability, for there is none of either for the present, but rather, threat in terms of potentiality. It is potential the federals fear most. Whether that potential exists in an individual or group is incidental. The federals measure potential threat in terms of what might happen given a situation conducive to action on the part of a resistive organization or individual. Accurate intelligence gathering allows them to assess the potential. Showing one's hand before the bets are made is a sure way to lose.

The movement for freedom is rapidly approaching the point where, for many people, the option of belonging to a group will be non-existent. For others, group membership will be a viable option for only the immediate

future. Eventually, and perhaps much sooner than most believe possible, the price paid for membership will exceed any perceived benefit. But for now, some of the groups that do exist often serve a useful purpose either for the newcomer who can be indoctrinated into the ideology of the struggle, or for generating positive propaganda to reach potential freedom fighters. It is sure that, for the most part, this struggle is rapidly becoming a matter of individual action, each of its participants making a private decision in the quietness of his heart to resist: to resist by any means necessary.

It is hard to know what others will do, for no man truly knows another man's heart. It is enough to know what one himself will do. A great teacher once said "know thyself." Few men really do, but let each of us promise ourselves not to go quietly to the fate our would-be masters have planned.

The concept of leaderless resistance is nothing less than a fundamental departure in theories of organization. The orthodox scheme of organization is diagrammatically represented by the pyramid, with the mass at the bottom and the leader at the top. This fundamental of organization is to be seen not only in armies, which are, of course, the best illustration of the pyramid structure, with the mass of soldiery (the privates) at the bottom responsible to corporals; who are in turn responsible to sergeants, and so on up the entire chain of command to the generals at the top. But the same structure is seen in corporations, ladies' garden clubs, and in our political system itself. This orthodox "pyramid" scheme of organization is to be seen basically in all existing political, social, and religious structures in the world today, from the Federal government to the Roman Catholic Church.

The Constitution of the United States, in the wisdom of the Founders, tried to sublimate the essential dictatorial nature pyramidal organization by dividing authority into three: executive, legislative, and judicial. But the pyramid remains essentially untouched. This scheme of organization, the pyramid, is not only useless, but extremely dangerous for the participants when it is utilized in a resistance movement against state tyranny. Especially is this so in technologically advanced societies where electronic surveillance can often penetrate the structure, thus revealing its chain of command. Experience has revealed over and over again that anti-state political organizations utilizing this method of command and control are easy prey for government infiltration, entrapment, and destruction of the personnel involved. This has been seen repeatedly in the United States where pro-government infiltrators or agent provocateurs weasel their way into patriotic groups and destroy them from within.

In the pyramid form of organization, an infiltrator can destroy anything which is beneath his level of infiltration, and often those above him as well. If the traitor has infiltrated at the top, then the entire organization from the top down is compromised and may be traduced at will.

An alternative to the pyramid form of organization is the cell system. In the past, many political groups (both left and right) have used the cell system to further their objectives. Two examples will suffice. During the American Revolution, "committees of correspondence" were formed throughout the Thirteen Colonies. Their purpose was to subvert the government and thereby aid the cause of independence. The "Sons of Liberty," who made a name for themselves by dumping government taxed tea into the harbor at Boston, were the action arm of the committees of correspondence. Each committee was a secret cell that operated totally independently of the other cells. Information on the government was passed from committee to committee, from colony to colony, and then acted upon on a local basis. Yet even in those bygone days of poor communication, of weeks to months for a letter to be delivered, the committees, without any central direction whatsoever, were remarkably similar in tactics employed to resist government tyranny. It was, as the first American Patriots knew, totally unnecessary for anyone to give an order for anything. Information was made available to each committee, and each committee acted as it saw fit.

A recent example of the cell system taken from the left wing of politics are the Communists. The Communists, in order to get around the obvious problems involved in pyramidal organization, developed to an art the cell system. They had numerous independent cells which operated completely isolated from one another and particularly with no knowledge of each other, but were orchestrated together by a central headquarters. For instance, during WWII, in Washington, it is known that there were at least six secret Communist cells operating at high levels in the United States government (plus all the open Communists who were protected and promoted

by President Roosevelt), however, only one of the cells was rooted out and destroyed. How many more actually were operating, no one can say for sure.

The Communist cells which operated in the U.S. until late 1991 under Soviet control could have at their command a leader who held a social position which appeared to be very lowly. He could be, for example, a busboy in a restaurant, but in reality a colonel or a general in the Soviet Secret Service, the KGB. Under him could be a number of cells, and a person active in one cell would almost never have knowledge of individuals who were active in other cells; in fact, the members of the other cells would be supporting that cell which was under attack and ordinarily would lend very strong support to it in many ways. This is at least part of the reason, no doubt, that whenever in the past Communists were attacked in this country, support for them sprang up in many unexpected places.

The effective and efficient operation of a cell system after the Communist model is, of course, dependent upon central direction, which means impressive organization, funding from the top, and outside support, all of which the Communists had. Obviously, American patriots have none of these things at the top or anywhere else, and so an effective cell organization based upon the Soviet system of operation is impossible.

Two things become clear from the above discussion. First, that the pyramid form of organization can be penetrated quite easily and it thus is not a sound method of organization in situations where the government has the resources and desire to penetrate the structure, which is the situation in this country. Secondly, that the normal qualifications for the cell structure based upon the Red model does not exist in the U.S. for patriots. This understood, the question arises "What method is left for those resisting state tyranny?"

The answer comes from Col. Amoss who proposed the "Phantom Cell" mode of organization which he described as Leaderless Resistance. A system of organization that is based upon the cell organization, but does not have any central control or direction, that is in fact almost identical to the methods used by the committees of correspondence during the American Revolution. Utilizing the Leaderless Resistance concept, all individuals and groups operate independently of each other, and never report to a central head-quarters or single leader for direction or instruction, as would those who belong to a typical pyramid organization.

At first glance, such a form of organization seems unrealistic, primarily because there appears to be no organization. The natural question thus arises as to how are the "Phantom Cells" and individuals to cooperate with each other when there is no inter-communication or central direction? The answer to this question is that participants in a program of leaderless resistance through "Phantom Cell" or individual action must know exactly what they are doing and how to do it. It becomes the responsibility of the individual to acquire the necessary skills and information as to what is to be done. This is by no means as impractical as it appears, because it is certainly true that in any movement all persons involved have the same general outlook, are acquainted with the same philosophy, and generally react to given situations in similar ways. The previous history of the committees of correspondence during the American Revolution shows this to be true.

Since the entire purpose of leaderless resistance is to defeat state tyranny (at least in so far as this essay is concerned), all members of phantom cells or individuals will tend to react to objective events in the same way through usual tactics of resistance. Organs of information distribution such as newspapers, leaflets, computers, etc., which are widely available to all, keep each person informed of events, allowing for a planned response that will take many variations. No one need issue an order to anyone. Those idealists truly committed to the cause of freedom will act when they feel the time is ripe, or will take their cue from others who precede them. While it is true that much could be said against this kind of structure as a method of resistance, it must be kept in mind that leaderless resistance is a child of necessity. The alternatives to it have been shown to be unworkable or impractical. Leaderless resistance has worked before in the American Revolution, and if the truly committed put it to use themselves, it will work now.

It goes almost without saying that Leaderless Resistance leads to very small or even one-man cells of resistance. Those who join organizations to play "let's pretend" or who are "groupies" will quickly be weeded out. While for those who are serious about their opposition to federal despotism, this is exactly what is desired.

From the point of view of tyrants and would-be potentates in the federal bureaucracy and police agencies, nothing is more desirable than that those who oppose them be UNIFIED in their command structure, and that EVERY person who opposes them belong to a pyramid style group. Such groups and organizations are easy to kill. Especially in light of the fact that the Justice (sic) Department promised in 1987 that there would never be another group to oppose them that they did not have at least one informer in! These federal "friends of government" are ZOG or ADL intelligence agents. They gather information that can be used at the whim of a federal D.A. to prosecute. The line of battle has been drawn.

Patriots are REQUIRED, therefore, to make a conscious decision to either aid the government in its illegal spying (by continuing with old methods of organization and resistance), or to make the enemy's job more difficult by implementing effective countermeasures.

Now there will, no doubt, be mentally handicapped people out there who will state emphatically in their best red, white, and blue voice, while standing at a podium with an American flag draped in the background and a lone eagle soaring in the sky above, that, "So what if the government is spying? We are not violating any laws." Such crippled thinking by any serious person is the best example that there is a need for special education classes. The person making such a statement is totally out of contact with political reality in this country, and unfit for leadership of anything more than a dog sled in the Alaskan wilderness. The old "Born on the Fourth of July" mentality that has influenced so much of the Aryan-American Patriot's thinking in the past will not save him from the government in the future. "Reeducation" for non-thinkers of this kind will take place in the federal prison system where there are no flags or eagles, but an abundance of men who were "not violating any laws."

Most groups who "unify" their disparate associates into a single structure have short political lives. Therefore, those movement leaders constantly calling for unity of organization, rather than the desirable Unity of Purpose, usually fall into one of three categories:

1. They may not be sound political tacticians, but rather, just committed men who feel unity would help their cause, while not realizing that the government would greatly benefit from such efforts. The Federal objective, to imprison or destroy all who oppose them, is made easier in pyramid organizations.
2. Or, perhaps, they do not fully understand the struggle they are involved in, and that the government they oppose has declared a state of war against those fighting for faith, folk, freedom, property and constitutional liberty. Those in power will use any means to rid themselves of opposition.
3. The third class calling for unity, and let us hope this is the minority of the three, are men more desirous of the supposed power that a large organization would bestow, than of actually achieving their stated purpose.

Conversely, the LAST thing federal snoops want, if they had any choice in the matter, is a thousand different small phantom cells opposing them. It is easy to see why. Such a situation is an intelligence nightmare for a government intent upon knowing everything they possibly can about those who oppose them. The Federals, able to amass overwhelming strength of numbers, manpower, resources, intelligence gathering, and capability at any given time, need only a focal point to direct their anger [ie Waco]. A single penetration of a pyramid style organization can lead to the destruction of the whole. Whereas, leaderless resistance presents no single opportunity for the Federals to destroy a significant portion of the resistance.

With the announcement of the Department of Justice (sic) that 300 FBI agents formerly assigned to watching Soviet spies in the U.S. (domestic counter-intelligence) are now to be used to "combat crime," the federal government is preparing the way for a major assault upon those persons opposed to their policies. Modern Militiaman -- A Jo dedicated to the preservation of the America of our Forefathers can expect shortly to feel the brunt of a new federal assault upon liberty.

It is clear, therefore, that it is time to rethink traditional strategy and tactics when it comes to opposing state tyranny, where the rights now accepted by most as being inalienable will disappear. Let the coming night be filled with a thousand points of resistance. Like the fog which forms when conditions are right, and disappears when they are not, so must the resistance to tyranny be.

by **Louis R. Beam Jr.**

.

From: Jeff_Randall_CopWatch@aol.com
Date: Sat, 12 Oct 1996 14:57:57 -0400

Subject: West Virginia Wannabe Syndrome?

Seems as though the militia has become easy pickings for the various groups of federal law enforcement. This recent arrest of a "2 star 'wannabe' general" in West Virginia should further prove to every group, that they have been infiltrated. Even if 10 percent of what the government is accusing is correct, then I consider the West Virginia Mountaineer Militia to be real dumbasses. All these groups that continue to dress up in their SF berets, pin on the insignia, and train in the woods, do nothing but serve the government's interest when they are arrested for something foolish. And, by the way, I watched the video of the W Virginia militia training in the woods, and from what I could gather, this "training" was nothing more than a bunch of guys having fun, rather than real tactics.....militias need to understand that you will react as you have practiced, so why does someone want to train wrong.....go to a professional if you want real training.

Recently someone ask me why the militia movement seem to be falling apart, I responded that it was because of all the general stars, and other "ranks" that have flooded the movement, the egos are always the one's wearing the rank, and usually the one's wearing the star(s) are the one's who have the least leadership ability, or, at least that's been my educated opinion from what I've observed in this movement. Many of the real players in this movement have quietly faded back into the background, not wanting to be associated with this major wannabe syndrome that so easily manifests itself in a typical militia meeting, especially during a national gathering. A man joked to me the other day that the only two things that are in short supply this winter in Michigan are heating oil and general stars.

Other reasons the public movement seems to be on a downward swing is because of dis-trust withing one's own group....and rightfully so. We have seen a major group leader accept money from the FBI, and boast about it in court, and then ask the movement to forgive him and accept him back. We have groups setting up "anti-drug task forces," when the one's setting them up are either active drug users or have a past of drug related arrests or rehab centers, then we have the hypocrits who raise hell about the KKK and Aryan groups, when all along they are white separatist themselves, only making their plays for the public, and trying to convince everyone that "I'm not a racist !!!." This whole movement has now become nothing more than actors, attempting to convince the world they are something more (or less) than they really are. What's missing in this movement, and one of the problems, is the plain old no bullshit honesty. The type of honesty that you say what's on your mind, not giving a damn who you piss off, militia or non-militia, black, white, indian, slant-eye or jewish, federal agent or local cop. Not the "honesty" that is politically correct....it seems every militia group out there is constantly flying under the "non-racist" flag....every 3rd sentence from their mouth when dealing with the press, is "we're non-racist."....again, playing to the public and attempting to be somewhat "militia politically correct," but when you get them in private, their real views open up. Why the hell can't people just say what's on their minds, without worrying about who it pisses off?

Some of these guys join or form a militia, stating the Constitution, tyranny and other things as their reasoning, when it's really nothing more than watching too many Rambo and Red Dawn movies on TV. Sorry..... Rambo and Wolverines, the real battle's aren't being waged that way, just ask Bob Starr, Mike Kemp and others like them. If you want to get in the trenches with the real fight, then throw away all this BDU, Beret, Camo-face

paint bullshit, and use your head to help folks like Starr and Kemp battle these bastards in court. To hell with sending out more petty declarations, they only serve to get you laughed at, like the general's stars. To hell with trying to prove you're not racist or a terrorist....most of the time trying to prove a negative makes you appear guilty, and the bottom line is: those you are trying to prove yourself to, don't really give a damn either way.....you're not even a good sideline distraction.

When a movement grows rapidly or becomes too confident it will surely undergo reconstructive surgery....and that's what's happening to the current militia movement. Sure, you will continue to have the "4 star wannabes," and those who will follow these ego-driven nutcases, but the real players will continue to bail out and refuse to be part of this public militia that's evolved into nothing more than a target rich zone for federal agents.

Think about it folks, the feds can't go wrong when they arrest anyone in the militia that dresses in BDUs and wears a beret with stars pinned all over it. The public laughs at these guys and calls them fruitcakes...the feds have already won the battle before they ever go to court. If you want to stay out of jail, then you'll lose the rambo wannabes out of your group, refuse to even discuss anything illegal, and when you want training, go to a reputable LEGAL training establishment (which there are many), otherwise militia meetings should consist of casually dressed people getting together for a cookout and target practice. If any of you in the militia think you're smart enough to pull off something illegal, then you're wrong, you do not have the time, money and resources the federal government has to watch you. So stay legal, speak honestly and dress casual....why do you want to attract attention to yourselves?

Jeff Randall

.

.

From: Jeff_Randall_CopWatch@aol.com
Date: Sun, 13 Oct 1996 16:09:50 -0400

Subject: Agents Provocateurs Are Helpful to the Cause

In a message dated 96-10-13 02:58:48 EDT, Martin Lindstedt writes:

<< No shortage of militia cannon fodder, though. The thing I appreciate about agents provocateur is that it encourages survival of the fittest. The fedgoons get the ineffectual crazies and leave the teeth be for now. >>

Jeff responds:

That's the best explanation I've heard.

The recent arrests of militia personnel is perhaps one of the healthiest things that has happened to the movement. Although people such as Bob Starr, and others are suffering, it forces many others into using their heads and releases them from this "bulletproof" mentality they have. I believe it also brings about a little reality check for some of these guys. How many militia members have we heard say they're going to kill anyone who comes after them, "not going alive," is the words they use, however, when 15 guys armed with MP5s surround you, it forces you away from TV land, and into a whole new world of reality.

And, yes, we need agents provocatuer, informants, snitches and down right set-ups to keep the movement healthy and on its toes. Lately, this is not in short supply, so every militia out there ought to be receiving some real good training. If the movement was allowed to go on, as is, without a problem every now and then, militias would be totally useless, from lack of experience, should something major happen and their response needed.

From my past dealings, I have found that the best and most able men are usually the ones who love challenges, enjoy a conflict, and bored if nothing is happening. These men have deep fears but have learned to control that

to their advantage by feeding on it. They refuse to give up mentally or physically and sometimes push themselves past danger zones, but will never tell you about it. They may sometimes be described as psychotic, independent, argumentative, ego driven and somewhat insecure. But, one thing for sure, they don't wear stars on their BDUs or berets that they didn't earn. They don't put face paint on and play weekend warrior. They just remain quiet, and go about their day to day jobs and lives looking for their next fix. Many of the real players won't even claim militia affiliation, but are the real driving force behind it. I said all that to say this: The people that are currently getting put in jail by the feds are not the real players or thinkers in this movement, however, jail time may evolve them into that role. No disrespect meant to Starr, Viper Team, W. Virginia Militia or any others the feds have recently incarcerated, but they just fit the government's profile of a militia member and became an easy target because of their naive and trusting nature.

As much as I like Bob Starr, and even knowing he's innocent, he was still foolish for getting involved in this bullshit public warrior-training mentality, he was a fool to trust all the people that he did and probably a whole lot naive in thinking that they cannot do anything to an innocent man. That's bullshit, and he's now finding that out.... just as Tom Posey did when he went to jail on totally bogus charges. What this will do, however, is make stronger and smarter men, tighter groups, increased unit security, and further resolve in the militia's mind to win the "war." Which, in my opinion, is very beneficial to this movement, even though, it totally screws a few. Starr, W. Virginia, Vipers and others are just casualties of the war, and should they all be convicted, there's not a damn thing we can do about it, but continue on and not let it affect our judgement. The fight is about the whole, not the few.

These arrests should be used as training tools for other units, the feds are establishing a definite, obvious pattern by these arrests, personally, I find that very easy to exploit, by examining what has taken place by the feds in the past few months. Read their press releases and view some of the news footage, you'll see what I'm talking about. These people are real idiots, using very un-secure methods for obtaining information and arrests. (For example: accepting disgruntled militia members as their primary witnesses/informants.... talk about a weakness that an easy militia operation could exploit... just think of the possible set-ups and embarrassments using that federal weakness.) These people are not even gifted amateurs, when you study the profiles, and worked the feds as I have for the past few years, you begin to realize all the weaknesses, especially in their intelligence gathering. Like I said, not even gifted amateurs.

There is obvious tension within the ranks of federal law enforcement. We know for fact that many of the agencies are refusing to share intel and serious in-house fighting is taking place. There are some good folks inside that are damn tired of the bad ones, you must continue to exploit that fact. There is absolutely no reason to want to blow up any federal building or harm any law enforcement officer, when they are already on the road to self-destruction. Don't be suckered by these arrests, these people would love to take down the thinkers of this movement, they would love for someone to make a retaliatory "strike"...don't let it happen. Keep your head, stay cool, and let them continue on their little arrest circuit....like Martin said, it encourages survival of the fittest. Use the hardships of the foolish to your educational advantage.

All of you in the militia movement better damn well hope you get Clinton re-elected because it's your only shot at surviving and winning. This man has produced more in-house tension and bad attitudes than any other president in history... all trust within this administration is gone, no one trusts anyone else. Government is self-destructing because of this administration... why not lay back, and let it continue?

For every action there is an equal and opposite reaction, and the real winner from all of these federal arrests, is the patriot movement as a whole, if they will keep their heads screwed on straight and not allow government to force a dumb reaction.

Jeff

.

.

Date: Wed, 16 Oct 1996 17:43:38 -0400
To: eplurib@megalinx.net
From: militia@megalinx.net (J.J. Johnson).

Subject: The Militia

Due to the recent events concerning the militia in Georgia, Arizona, Washington, Florida, and now West Virginia, it should be self evident that a course correction must be considered for certain elements of this movement.

Some would say that we should just "stay the course", and keep moving forward. But many are now openly claiming that this same policy may be, in part, what is causing the attacks on these units. Some even believe that we should "stand down".

The "leadership" of the militia movement must share much of the blame for remaining silent while the political climate in which this movement operated changed dramatically. Many of us saw the internal problems within the militia, but we chose not to publicly address these issues in order to present a presumption of unity.

Prior to April 19, 1995, the militia, as a whole, had just begun to network itself throughout the nation. Events in Idaho and Texas woke many Americans up, and a newly elected congress gave us hope that victory was on the horizon.

But the in-fighting had already begun. We failed to put principles before personalities. We obtained our rank and "titles of nobility" from the military surplus stores... and the press (Veterans excluded). We attempted to structure ourselves as a conventional army, but failed to establish a financial support base, and an alternative network of communication. Although our goal was clear (preserve, protect and defend the Constitution and the Bill of Rights), we could not develop a national consensus on what was needed most: a method of implementation.

The concept that drives this movement may be it's greatest hindrance. The modern-day militia was created from a healthy, justifiable fear of government. It is the fear of losing our rights as individuals that keeps us "individual" by nature, thus making it difficult to agree on almost anything.

After April 19, 1995, the militia movement was forced to defend itself on the battlefield of public opinion. Media coverage that had previously not been available (at any price), was suddenly at all of our doorsteps. Although we avoided a mass physical confrontation, we were unwittingly already at war.

Many of us simply were not prepared to handle the large number of Americans who didn't believe the Oklahoma lies, and wanted to sign up. While the increase in participation was welcome, we were too preoccupied with "justifying and defending our own existence" to concern ourselves with quality recruitment . . . numbers were everything.

Defending our position wasn't easy. For a while, there was unity of purpose, but to some degree, defending ourselves against OKC depleted resources needed for our primary purpose. In my opinion, the desire for a kinder, gentler militia paved the way for the rise of the Common Law movement.

Although the Common Law activists effectively exposed the corruption in the judicial system of this nation, it [with]drew its base of support from the militia, reducing the number of active militia personnel, and compromising the resolve of the militia overall. This evidence came to bear with the murder of Chaplain Mike Hill in Ohio. Many in the militia stated that Hill's fellow travelers should have taken a more direct action toward defending their friend. Instead, the result was depositions, followed by lack of justice. Many of us were convinced we could secure our liberties via the seventh amendment. Today, there are many incarcerated militia members questioning the wisdom of a common law defense in a statutory court, which operates under a code of military justice.

As political divisions and personality conflicts increased, we allowed ourselves to be compromised and infiltrated by our own shortcomings. Our drive for increased participation caused us to seek quantity, rather than

quality of membership. We continued fighting off the negative stereotypes, while preparing for an enemy who had already advanced into our position, and caused us to use our most effective weapons ... against ourselves.

Much of the militia "leadership" (myself included) had full knowledge of these problems. But we chose to remain silent out of fear of character assassinations, loss of support, or exposing our weaknesses to the opposition. Many of the "leaders" had depleted their personal resources on providing information and defending this movement. We became financially dependent on those who profited from "fear- mongering", and the grassroots support of the militia movement. Few of us chose poverty over compromising our integrity.

We had to pay the bills. It was more important to sell our wares at trade shows, maintain an audience via newsletters, short-wave, satellite, etc. than it was to admit that this movement may be headed for self-destruction. Although the militia needed leadership, we didn't want leaders, we wanted cheerleaders ... and that's exactly what we got.

Aside from a few victories, we have been psychologically disarmed. In the eyes of the public (and many patriots) from which we hope to draw our support, the militia has gone from being a "constitutional safety net", to the "excuse" for congress to pass more bad legislation, and we have provided a safe environment for domestic state-sponsored terrorists. While continuing to preach unity, justice, doom and gloom, pointing the blame at government, and not "practicing what we preached", we have become the modern-day "tele-evangelists".

Harsh reality, isn't it ? It hurts to say many of these things, but to repair the damage, and establish a more solid foundation, we must first clear away the rubble. Although no malice is intended toward any militia member, I fully expect an onslaught of character assassinations from within my own ranks. But the operational security and unit integrity of the militia movement must no longer be compromised. Covering up our mistakes make us no better than the bureaucracy we're fighting against.

THE TRUTH

... It is the nature of an oppressive government to legislate any means of lawfully defending one's self against such oppression out of existence....

That is ... The discussion of making lawful contingency plans for one's personal defense, once tolerated by government, is now considered suspect, if not illegal.

As we prepare to battle against enemies foreign and domestic, let us recognize that the domestic enemy NOW has his foot in our door, his hand in our pocket, and his gun in our face. Each militia member must face this reality, and understand that at any moment (especially on the road) your freedom (or your life) can disappear, even though you are innocent. Once you fully comprehend this unsavory truth, make sure your loved ones understand it as well.

The ever increasing burden of unconstitutional legislation, executive orders, and corrupt justice will make us criminals, by the stroke of a pen. Although we haven't broken any law, we have already been indicted by the press.

Dropping out, or keeping a low profile won't work. Your existence is still a threat to your opposition. You're already on a "list". There's already a "sting operation" and/or a "bogus" charge with your name on it. You, the militia, may well be all that stands in the way of total tyranny.

There is no need to prepare for war. There is no need to avoid war. We are at war. We didn't declare it, it was declared on us. Not like Desert Storm, Vietnam, or WW II, but political, psychological, economic, and yes, spiritual warfare. Until recently, our enemy's greatest advantage was the fact that we didn't even know it. Like other wars, there are casualties. Not just those in jail (P.O.W's), but their families whose lives have been devastated as well. M.I.A.'s refugees, and even the dead bodies of patriots are mounting . . . but where do we draw the line ?

MY OPINIONS

Each person must decide, based on his own conscience and conviction where they will draw the line. Your opposition has already drawn theirs.

Before we can defend this nation against tyranny, we must be able to defend ourselves and our loved ones. Each militia member must know how to conduct themselves properly when confronting the opposition in order to avoid a unnecessary engagement. To put it simply... Don't give 'em a reason.

UNIT INTEGRITY

The dedication of many in this movement has put an undue burden on their families. Although many units have adopted a military-like command and control structure, militia members have made too many domestic sacrifices to insure such order. On several occasions, units have had to scramble to salvage items of a fellow member due to "domestic problems".

1996 has taught the Johnson family a hard lesson: Let the unit insignia of the "unorganized militia" be determine by Last Name, i.e., the family must be the basic "unit cell" that networks with other "units" to form an effective Constitutional fighting force. If your spouse is not as active as you, either bring them (and the children, if possible) to the meeting with you, or take a step back, and focus on the home-front for a while. Just exactly who are you REALLY willing to fight and die for, anyway ?

This philosophy may not bode well with already existing units, but a sound, stable home is the best defense against an unconstitutional government. A strong family unit also makes for a safer house for fellow travelers who may be forced into exile, after making the moral decision to defend their lawful, God given rights. Units who organize under this concept will soon stand out among the others.

We must also strive to support our fallen brethren and their families, regardless of our personal differences. We are ALL innocent until proven otherwise. The day may come when we find ourselves in the same predicament.

NETWORKING

The word 'militia' means, citizen soldier. Citizen first, soldier when necessary. To avoid past mistakes, we must come to the realization that a communication network is not a "policy making network". We don't have to agree on ideology, just agree to what, when, where, and how to communicate. I have been to enough state-wide gatherings (in several states) to know that we need some form of written guidelines for conduct, due to our very nature. We also need elected officers to administrate these rules. In the absence of cohesion . . . nothing is accomplished and communications break down.

However, the authority of these guidelines and administrative officers should only be in effect between the opening and closing prayer of these communication networking meetings, leaving the individual states, counties, and units to organize and conduct themselves autonomously.

In any type of networking, all information (SITREPs, SALUTE reports, etc.) should be sourced and documented. Information not meeting this criteria should be discarded or treated as rumor.

In order to achieve our common goal (restoration of Constitutional governance), we must have good intelligence (information). That's what communication networks are created for. With all the differences we have, we still must recognize that we live on the same piece of dirt, between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans. We have to fight on and for the same . . . TOGETHER. No more casualties from 'friendly fire' (character assassinations) can be tolerated. Time is too short.

OPERATIONAL SECURITY

Units should use recent federal operations against the collective militia as a learning tool. To avoid being caught up in a federal trolling net, create and implement an effective alternative network of communication. The Constitutional militia is defensive in nature. Persons who advocate preemptive military assaults; procurement, sale, or manufacture of illegal ordinance; acts of treason; or other unlawful behavior, should be dismissed as provocateurs, whether they are on the government payroll or not. Evidence has shown they are NOT patriots. They are NOT leaders.

As we gather intelligence, we should discuss lawful countermeasures for securing the home-front first. Most confrontations by the opposition occur either in the home or on the road. We must also gather as much information about operatives of the opposition as they have gathered about us. Remember: Never take any action that you cannot defend in court. Pray for the best; plan for the worst.

Recognizing our opposition's goal to totally control our lives, families should develop a program of self-sufficiency. Alternative medicine, alternative energy, and home schooling are just some examples of regaining control of our own lives.

CONCLUSION

I don't have all the answers. My goal is to address an issue that many others can't (or won't). I encourage comments from others, pro or con. As enforcement actions against individuals and units escalate, we are all effected. No more declarations. No more "sabre rattling". GOD and FAMILY are the only tools this COUNTRY needs. The steps for Constitutional restoration are clearly outlined in our Bill Of Rights. It's time to "roll up our sleeves and get down to business". Leaders must lead by example. To effectively wage battle, I firmly believe NOW is the time for the militia to aggressively conduct reconnaissance on our most dangerous enemy...

...and start by looking in the mirror.

J.J. Johnson -- October 16, 1996

From: CopWatch@aol.com
Date: Tue, 20 Aug 1996 17:12:12 -0400

Subject: warfare thoughts

- (1) There is always one more son-of-a-bitch than you counted on
- (2) When you think this is as bad as it gets....don't bet on it
- (3) Happiness is merely the remission of pain
- (4) Sometimes too much to drink isn't enough
- (5) The facts, though interesting, are irrelevant
- (6) The careful application of terror is also a form of communication
- (7) Someone who thinks logically is a nice contrast to the real world
- (8) Anything worth fighting for is worth fighting dirty for
- (9) Friends may come and friends may go, but enemies accumulate
- (10) When you see the truth, it will make no sense
- (11) Suicide is the most sincere form of self criticism
- (12) If you think there is good in everybody, you haven't met everybody
- (13) If you can smile when things go wrong, you have someone in mind to blame
- (14) There is absolutley no substitute for a genuine lack of preparation
- (15) Not one shred of evidence exists in favor of the idea that life is serious
- (16) When all else fails, switch selector to full, dump magazine, and run like hell

Jeff Randall

KEMP'S THREE LAWS

1. No Christian act goes unpunished.
2. Time wounds all heels.
3. Plant seeds of doubt in gardens of assholes.

A few takes on Jeff's *sweet sixteen*:

4. strike *drink,* insert *smoke.* 5. The facts though interesting, are irrelevant- and contradictory (see Jeff's number 10)
6. The proper application of communication is the BEST form of terror.
13. If you can keep your head when all about you are losing theirs, then you either don't understand or are the cause of it.

.



.

Date: Mon, 14 Oct 1996 09:22:49 -0700
From: [Joe Horn -- 6mysmesa@1eagle1.com](mailto:Joe_Horn_-_6mysmesa@1eagle1.com)
To: Texas Gun Owners

Subject: Roadblocks

Posted to texas-gun-owners by Joe Horn <6mysmesa@1eagle1.com>

Speaking of roadblocks, Saturday, the New Mexico State Police had one set up on NM#404, (14 officers and one Sgt.) stopping all traffic both ways on a desert mountain pass between El Paso and White Sands. When I was stopped, a courteous automaton approached, hand on pistol and asked for my DL and insurance card, and did a visual search of my car. Immediately angered and resentful of this State intrusion and violation of my rights, I handed him the requested documents, and having checked my paperwork, he looks through the window at the back seat area and asks me "what's under the blanket?" I told him his search was going to have to be limited to what he could see as I was not granting a consent search beyond what he could see through the windows of my vehicle after illegally stopping me at this roadblock. Illegal? Pull over there and talk to the nice officers, says he. Yes I said, stopping people for searches in the pretext of seeing their paperwork. Says he: the court said it's OK (in limited Roadblocks)as long as we stop everyone. Says I, the court is wrong and it's still unconstitutional, you do not have a warrant and I have broken no law. To me, the fact they did NOT ask for vehicle registration indicated they were fishing. The robot calls his Sgt. over, who takes over and warns me that this can become very unpleasant, and at this point, I show him my retired badge and ID, asking how unpleasant is that? He then says, why didn't you say something, you coulda been gone by now? I told him that I am a plain citizen and suggest he knows what he's doing is wrong and that it's a pure fishing expedition. He angrily said:(and he really surprised me) "Hey, I'm just doing what I'm told, now get outta here before I decide to ruin your day".

They cut me loose and drove off, keeping my Ithaca 37 which was under the blanket and 1911A1 under the center console.

My point is that this is out of control, and folks are going to start getting hurt in these little European-like (vere are your papers?) roadblocks, fishing for whatever they can find. If I didn't have masterbadge and I.D., I would have been illegally and unconstitutionally searched against my will. Very few people have a badge to get them out of something like this, and deferring to intimidation by armed authority, most will have their rights violated. My sense of the roadblock personnel was that excepting the Sgt., they didn't know they were wrong or didn't care. The average age of the officers was late 20's early 30's.

Now that they're going to start these around schools, and I assure you that it will be in as high handed a manner as they can manage. Many people don't see or don't want to see what's happening to the Constitution or our human rights recognized by that Constitution, or the Police State being assembled right around the Constitution, in the name of the "drug war" or the "chirrun". It's here and it's here now and if you don't strenuously object to these searches and roadblocks whether for DUI, Drivers License/Insurance/guns/drugs, and drive your political reps nuts about it, sooner or later you will get the anal probe of an illegal search in the name of the "drug war" or for guns near schools. Of course those that like and feel safer with more unenforceable, useless law and more intrusion (with no effect on criminals, just the violation of honest citizens rights) may you be hoisted on your own petard, and soon.

As I waited in line to be searched in this desolate and remote desert location, I reflected on my extensive police and military training and experience and thought that these roadblocks are really quite vulnerable out there in the desert so far from backup. Quite vulnerable It's going to get ugly one day when folks decide they've had enough. And if statists don't think it can happen here, just visualize a larger scale resentment of the "man" beyond Watts. Like the black minority, the white minority within the white majority has it's limits in absorbing the abuses and effects of the ever intrusive Police State.

What really bothered me, (in spite of my training and familiarity with police operations) was my own barely repressible reaction of fear, being trapped, resentment, mistrust, disrespect and intense dislike and the powerful urge to immediately, actively and physically resist this infringement of my right of unrestricted and peaceful travel. Fortunately, I didn't have to act because unlike most of my fellow citizens, I had a retired peace officer's badge. What about those that feel like that and do not have a getoutta jail/roadblock exit badge? I guess we'll soon find out when some get stopped and fight rather than have their rights violated. It's no longer a matter of if this is going to happen, just when.

regards

Joe Horn

List retired cop and no longer proud of it.

.

.

From: CopWatch@aol.com
Date: Sun, 18 Aug 1996 11:37:29 -0400
To: eplurib@megalinx.net
Subject: Political Warfare

In a message dated 96-08-18 10:19:54 EDT, Helen Johnson writes:

>Color me stupid...I fail to see the difference between Clinton and
>Dole...and cannot comprehend sending one cent to the National Rifle
>Association. If we're going to support a gun organization, for
>goodness sake, support one that comprehends and defends our God-given,
>Constitutionally guaranteed rights...Comprimise is what got us where
>we are today!

Call me stupid, but I'm actively campaigning and fully intend to pull the lever for Clinton/Dole....no joke!! If the Dole/Kemp ticket wins, you will see a large group of people proclaim "everything's gonna be allright." The Ken Hamblin's, G. Gordon Liddy's and Rush Limbaughs of the world (who carry a lot of support within the "dumbed down" conservative movement) will give their audiences a perception, that the country will, once again, become great, and politics are, once again, honest. You will lose a major portion of the pissed off Americans due to a false sense of security. I'm sorry folks, but Clinton is the man who got this steamroller running and woke millions of people up. Think about it, the only way this movement will continue to receive public support is to re-elect this criminal, allow him to continue on his ways of oppression, and allow Rush, Ken, G-man and the remainder of the country, a whipping boy. This way we will keep the corruption of government in the public mind. You put the Republicans in, and you will receive the same tyrannical government, only less conspicuous, in turn, you will lose the support of the conservative crowd, when you attempt to show them where the Republican party is no different than the Democratic party.

The wisest tactical political move that could be made by the Patriot movement is to help re-elect Clinton, otherwise, the only thing left may very well be armed revolution. You re-elect this man, and armed revolution will not be necessary, because the people will get fed up enough to say "no more," and produce a true political revolution by electing Constitutional candidates. People will run as long as there is an escape, but back them in a corner, and you have a real fight. Once this fight progresses in the human mind, they will not settle for minor changes, they will force government, without compromise, to return to honest governement, or else. Don't make the mistake of putting people back to sleep with by simply changing figure-heads. We've already got a lot of the public motivated and pissed off, why do we want to let them crawl back in their safe zone?

If you want more people on the side of Patriots, then re-elect the present criminals to the Whitehouse...and for good measure, throw in a few liberal Congressman this go around.

To all the Libertarians that will say their candidate will change the system, I agree, but logic proves to me that your man does not have a chance....yet. You will never get the Limbaugh republicans to vote for you....yet. In order to achieve true Constitutional government, more people will have to be oppressed and woke up. The only way that will be achieved is to make a tactical political move and give them 4 more years of the present criminal....let the Hamblin Republicans get stomped on a little more, let the taxes increase, let the gun grabbers have their way a little longer, let them piss off people that would otherwise be put to sleep by electing Dole, then the true Constitutional candidate will have a real chance. If the Libertarians, and other political parties, were smart, they would endorse Clinton and explain their reasoning for it.

Damn folks this is political warfare we're in, sometime you allow the opponet to win, or at least think he's won. I was serious when I said a few months back that the whole Patriot movement needs to endorse Clinton....use your head folks and become tacticians instead of

strategist.

Jeff Randall

From: CopWatch@aol.com
Date: Sun, 18 Aug 1996 15:11:59 -0400
Subject: Re: Political Warfare

In my endorsement of Bill Clinton to further the patriot movement,
the following are responses:

Jeff Randall

=====

Mike Kemp responds:

WHAT FOLLOWS IS AN ELEGANT AND FORTHRIGHT DISCUSSION OF THE
NECESSARY ACTIONS FACING THE PATRIOT COMMUNITY. PLEASE READ AND HEED
AND FORWARD

This means that we are going to be in for a wild and nasty ride
for the next few years, folks, but we already knew that, didn't
we?

HEARTILY ENDORSED.

In Liberty

William Michael Kemp

=====

Randy Solomon responds:

We are NOT to do the convenient, pragmatic, political or tactical thing
only what is morally right and leave the outcome in Gods hands. All else
is bogus.
Make mine Howard Phillips/US Taxpayers Party or Charles Collins as write
in.
To back Clinton is NUTS.

=====

Helen Johnson responds:

Speaking as a tactician, who believes the government most controllable
by us and which has the greatest impact upon us is the government
closest to us, try this one on for size:

The Central Committee is made up of Committeeman from each of the
Precincts or Wards of the state. Different states refer to this
segmenting of the populace differently. Some states call it a precinct
others call it a ward. This political sub-division is comprised of
approximately 500 people.

The committeeman is the lowest of all elected political positions and
receives no pay, therefore, the position generally goes uncontested
in the elections.

But...the Central Committee has an incredible amount of power.

They endorse the Republican and Democratic candidates in the primary
elections. These candidates then receive the blessing and money from
their respective parties...no questions asked.

So....picture this:

Each state has different election rules, so you'll have to check
with your Secretary of State, but here in Ohio, it only takes 5

signatures from your precinct to get on the ballot for the position of committeeman. Walking the streets of your precinct and introducing yourself to your potential constituents gives them a name and face to remember at election time.

What say we run Patriots as Democrats AND Republicans for the committeeman position to neutralize the ballot selections of the voters who are party loyalists. I believe this is referred to as infiltration. The end result is a Central Committee firmly in the control of the Patriot community.

We simultaneously run Patriots as Democrats and Republicans against the incumbents for the various town, city, county, and state positions. Again, we HAVE to run our candidates in both parties because so much of the voting public has been conditioned to vote party line without having the slightest idea what the candidate's platform consists of.

Since the Central Committee endorses the candidates, we (naturally) will be endorsing the Patriotic candidates.....check and mate.

Leave the 10-mile square District of Criminals in the control of those who have that rightful jurisdiction, let's focus on taking back our towns, cities, counties, and states.

In Liberty,

Helen Reed-Johnson

=====
Missouri 52nd militia colonel responds:

Helen..

Trust me.. the Republicans bring enough visable corruption in their baggage to carry us through another 4 years (at least).

The best that can happen is more patriotic Republicans will assist in forming a third party.

The worst that will happen is that those patriotic Republicans who are pissed-off now will stay pissed off on issues where they count.
=====

.

.

Date: Sun, 18 Aug 1996 15:17:46 -0800
From: Kevin McGehee
Reply-To: [Kevin McGehee -- mcgehee@mosquitonet.com](mailto:Kevin_McGehee_-_mcgehee@mosquitonet.com)
To: Kevin McGehee
Subject: FTW: I Respectfully Disagree

FROM THE TOP OF THE WORLD

by KEVIN McGEHEE (Editor of "The Armed Genius") North Pole, Alaska

Permission granted to anyone wishing to forward, redistribute, or broadcast this article, provided its source is properly acknowledged.
Thank you.
=====

I MUST RESPECTFULLY DISAGREE WITH THOSE WHO PROMOTE A "SUPPORT CLINTON" STRATEGY

There have been those in the patriot community who have argued that supporting Bob Dole for President isn't necessary to ensure that Bill Clinton won't be re-elected -- that the NWO establishment has "given up" on Clinton and he won't even be re-nominated. Personally, I think that if supporters of "Our Global Neighborhood" have an opinion of Clinton at all, it's probably that they love him -- people focus on the obvious, and Clinton's malefactions and misfeasances have been pretty damned obvious. He's never been a remarkably effective promoter of American de-sovereignty -- hell, the only thing he's ever promoted with any success is himself.

I have more recently received forwards suggesting that the best thing members of the patriot community can do is help get Clinton re-elected so he'll piss people off again and make them demand real change.

Really?

You mean like more Republicans in Congress, and a Republican President?

That's what "real change" meant to most people in 1994. Assuming that "Clinton Unchained" repeats its predecessor's performance and gets America PO'd at Clinton (even assuming Clinton isn't in the federal pen by this time next year!), that's what "real change" will mean to most Americans again in 1998 and 2000. To the extent that America blames congressional Republicans for whatever mess results, Clinton will get **less** blame, not more. Mainstream America, rightly or not, thinks of politics in bipolar terms as a result of more than 200 years of a two-party system. If "Party A" is to blame for our troubles, then let's support "Party B." And if "Party B" screws up we'll go back to "Party A."

If "Party A" is led by someone who has the willing connivance of Big Media (aka the Clinton/Gore Information Service) -- as well as a knack for exploiting shortened attention spans, widespread constitutional illiteracy, and an entrenched view of government not as Big Brother but as Big Nanny -- then bipolar politics takes on a much more dangerous significance.

In my opinion, you don't kill the patient in order to save him. There is plenty of blame to go around for the longevity of the present Federal Dictatorship of Roosevelt -- the Democrats for championing it in the first place; the Republicans for settling so long and so happily for minority status in Congress for most of the last six decades; and the rest for settling so long, and so contentedly, for having no more impact than to be quoted in Big Media as saying "a pox on both their houses."

Yes, you read me right. I am just as fervently devoted to the Constitution-as-written as any of the "Support Clinton" bunch in the patriot movement, but I recognize that the war to regain constitutional government will not be won by wishful thinking. Yes, I **wish** there were a viable constitutional party I could support with a realistic hope of its candidates getting elected and making a difference. And I **wish** there were a better **viable** alternative to Clinton Unchained than Dole Undead. While I'm at it, I **wish** this whole damned long slide into socialism had never started in the first place. And I **wish** I had a couple of trillion dollars so I could just pay off the national debt and write it off my taxes -- why think small?

It hurts me to part company with the people who are touting this "support Clinton" strategy, but I have to stand for what I think is right, and best for my country, and most likely to succeed. Voting for Bill Clinton's re-election fails on all counts.

What do I suggest? Bring the message of constitutional restoration into the major parties; you just might be surprised. In Alaska, constitutionalist Jim Dore is opposing Rep. Don Young for the Republican nomination for Alaska's seat in the Congress. Those of you who think a constitutionalist message gets no support in the GOP had best hold onto your bladders: at the state GOP convention Dore got eight standing ovations in six minutes.

Jim Dore's campaign probably won't succeed, because unfortunately people who give money to candidates don't give to the candidate whose message they like best, but to the one PERCEIVED as most likely to win. But perceptions can be changed. If constitutionalist voters turn out to support constitutionalist candidates -- with

both their votes and their money -- we *can* see the day when someone like Jim Dore can go to Washington City and vote, as Jim promises to do, to end the unconstitutional activity that makes up 75% of the federal budget.

The correct strategy, in *MY* opinion, is to reject the tendency -- which I might add just plays into the pockets of the establishment -- of pigeonholing ourselves as the kind of people who would rather freeze on the outside for the sake of pride, than crash the party (either one) and make a difference.

I have said on many occasions that this is not a one-day fight, but a long, slow, uphill struggle. I *wish* I were confident that I would see the day when the Constitution-as-written will be restored to its rightful place. The more I hear people argue that the best strategy is to help re-elect Bill Clinton, the more such confidence becomes just another example of wishful thinking.

-30-

August 18, 1996

=====

****Please send documented examples of liberal hate speech to Jeff Jacoby ****

"The Armed Genius" is the pro-freedom bimonthly newsletter for the thinking citizen.

--

Kevin McGehee
North Pole, Alaska

<http://www.mosquitonet.com/~mcgehee>

.

.

From: CopWatch@aol.com
Date: Sun, 18 Aug 1996 22:08:51 -0400
Subject: Re: Political Warfare

From "Re-Elect the Crook" Campaign Headquarters in Gallant Alabama:

The ongoing debate continues on whether the patriot community ought to help re-elect Clinton:

=====

J.J. Johnson (My two cents)

Regardless of who's in power, the executive (read: enforcement) branch of government will still run amok with no system of checks and balances, flagrantly violating our liberties. If we must vote, as I believe every patriot should register to vote to increase the chance of seating a fully informed juror, let us focus on a constitutional Sheriff who has the guts to arrest these bad boys and put them in their place.

Anyone for L.P. candidate Harry Browne ?

J.J. - Checking in from Jojah

=====

Terry Kautz responds:

I'm listening to ya'll but I'm gonna wait until election day to decide. I'm not convinced Clinton will be on the ballot anyway (but I know most of ya'll hope he will be). I love Helen's committeemans point, and her reminder to all that we need to be running in local elections (for this I am already preparing!). BUT no one has mentioned VOTE FRAUD - this is also something we should focus on.

=====
Richard Green responds:


Perhaps the solution is to elect a conservative House, and Bill Clinton, and then to Him Peach the tall boy with no moral compass in January of next year.

Then we can kick Al-Gor all day and all night just for fun.

That will expend political capital but it is cheaper by far than watching more and more of the people who work with KLINTON and his bride dropping dead or falling out of the sky in mysterious plane accidents. See today's Reuters for news on yet another plane crash to kill a Secret Service agent (or close personal assistant to Klinton.....).

Richard C. Green

.



.

From: CopWatch@aol.com
Date: Mon, 19 Aug 1996 17:36:17 -0400
Subject: Re: Political Warfare

In the ongoing debate over endorsing the Clinton/Gore ticket by members of the Patriot movement to achieve more pissed off people, thus creating a larger following within the movement, the following are recent responses.

Don Beauregard responds:

Well Jeff you make all the sense in the world. I think Billy boy is going to win any way but if you think differently you got my vote. See you in GA??

=====

Drew Rayner responds:

Hi Jeff,
Hot isn't it. I understand your point. The same thing can be accomplished without compromising your principles by voting for one of the third party candidates. That's what I did last election and I plan to do so again. That will accomplish the same thing again, I believe. I will probably stay with the little general in the Reform party. Keep stirring it up. It does make some people start to think.

=====

Nancy Lord responds:

You're right! This was my reaction to the Pat Buchanan campaign -- now its Dole. Klinton gets people fired up (and blown up) and he helps us. People are beginning to wonder about why there is no suspect in the TWA crash, the Olympic Park bombing (sure), the Amtrack derailment, and Vince Foster's suicide. It's gotten so bad that

FOBs (Friends of Bill) are considering Greyhound. Meanwhile:

Smoke a Joint, Lose Your License (or your home, your job, your life, your liberty, go to Talladega). Of course, I support Harry Browne though he has no chance, a vote for him is a statement of your views. But if you don't want to do a "protest vote" I agree for whatever it's worth: VOTE FOR KLINTON!!

See you at Bob's trial --- we're gonna kick their butts!

=====

Mike Perrin responds: (caution this one's rated PG13 -----JR)

Let's see who's in the race. There's Collins, Browne and Perot--- they don't have a chance. Not loud enough? THEY DON'T HAVE A FUCKING CHANCE!!!!!!!

That leaves Bill and Bob (if it were Billy Bob he could be from the South).

Bob ain't gonna change a damn thing---you're all dumbasses if you think he will.

Here's the problem I have with lettin' Slick Willie get un-elected and slick away. He's fucked about everything on 2 and 4 legs, he and his slut wife have stolen, cheated and lied more than everybody in Sodden ever did and all this shit is now coming to the surface and back to haunt them----- as long as Bill is still the Prez. If he's not the Prez anymore the media spotlight and public magnifying glass is gone and well hell--- we might not ever find out all the neat crimes these modern day Bonnie and Clyde have committed. (I mean no disrespect to Bonnie Parker and Clyde Barrow.)

You guys might be willin' to let the old pig fucker slide just to get rid of him but not me! I want him and the mrs. exposed fully while their in the white house ----Then we can hang em' both for the traitors they are!

Mike Perrin

=====

Kay Sheil responds:

Well, Jeff, I have to admitt you have a point and have convinced me to vote Clinton. After all folks, even if you change the man in the White House this fall you won't change the policies of the government. Then as Jeff says alot of sheeple will go back to sleep thinking they're safe and that the government headed by President Dole will protect them.

The problem with this kind of thinking is that the Republican presidents of the past three decades did as much damage, maybe more, to your rights than Clinton and did it with hardly a peep from anyone. Yeah, my advice is to vote Clinton/Gore or just forget about the top of the ticket and work very hard to elect the kind of people in your state who can and will stand up to the federal government.

=====

Libertarian Party of Missouri (sic) responds:

If you keep voting the way you've always been voting, then you are going to continue to get what you've always got. Well, I got tired of getting what I'd always got, broken promises coupled with more taxes and an ever more intrusive government. In the past, I too "wasted my vote" by casting it for the candidates that I believed to be the lesser of two evils. Finally, I got tired of the lack of principles exhibited by the GOP & Democrats and said; "Enough is enough!"

Since that day I have voted Libertarian in each and every election. I will do so again in '96 as I firmly believe that the Libertarian party is the last hope for a peaceful revolution in America. Harry Browne is an excellent candidate who firmly believes that our run-amuck Federal government should be reigned in and bound to it's constitutionally mandated functions. Can either Dole or Clinton say this and be trusted to truly mean it? I think not. Their actions have

proved otherwise.

To cast a vote for a candidate, whether it be Dole, Clinton or some other when you do not firmly agree with their platforms and instead hope for the lesser of two evils to be elected is a "wasted vote." It's akin to getting mugged and thanking the "nicer" of the two thugs for not beating you up as much as the other hoodlum. Is this what you truly wish for yourself and America?

Not voting your principles is a wasted vote because the "major" parties will never "get it" or be forced into reform without a strong showing among the protest votes. By casting your vote for a lesser evil candidate, you will only ensure that you (we) will continue to receive second best treatment and the sorry situation that we now find ourselves in will never change for the better. Is this how you would cast your ballot? To preserve the sorry status quo, or would you rather stand up, be counted and vote your principles?

The argument that the Libertarians will not win is true only if you do not vote for them. The same would be true of any parties candidates, whether they be Democrat, Republican, Green or Socialist Workers Party. I for one will stand on principle, something the Dole/Clinton campaigns sorely lack, and cast my vote for the candidate whom I believe truly stands for the Constitution and America. That candidate is Harry Browne, Libertarian for President in '96.

In the upcoming elections, be honest with yourself, stand on principle and vote not only for yourself, but for the future generations to come who will have to live with (and pay off) the legacy we leave behind. How would you wish to be remembered? One who voted for the lesser of two evils, or as one who voted for a return to the Constitution and for the restoration of our inalienable rights? Vote your principles, vote your conscience, vote Libertarian.

As America's Third Major Party, we welcome all parties interested in Life, Liberty and the Pursuit of Happiness. Join us!

Kevin J Goodwin, Boone County Chairman
Libertarian Party of Missouri.

=====

Jon Dougherty responds:

The problem with third parties is characterized by a third parties' lack of ability to get any electoral college votes; that is the body, we remember, that actually elects our presidents (supposedly forming a vote from the majority selected in each electoral district). Perot got 19% of the vote in 1992, but not a single electoral vote. In this day and age, a similar fate would befall a Charles Collins, Harry Browne, or any other third party or independent candidate. This is why, I believe, Pat Buchanan did not join a third party. He still believes the GOP should be changed to reflect the kind of party it used to be.

=====

I've been waiting on Martin Lindstedt to pop in....he responds:

I have been reading with interest the controversy started when Jeff Randall proposed working for Clinton/Bore for 4 More. I've looked at the arguments, pro & con, and most of them were well reasoned from the viewpoint of the authors.

The ones I agreed with the most were with Jeff Randall on the strategic portion and Helen Johnson on the tactical level.

Here is my reasoning:

Jeff is right about Clinton. He is the best recruiter our Cause ever

had. Doubt it?

I have not heard of a single militia organization which predates the Clinton administration. Not the Michigan Militia. Not the Militia of Montana. Not the Gadsden Minutemen. Not one.

Sure, there were a lot of us closet rebels around, but this movement was born at Waco, Texas. The earliest militia I hear about was the Michigan one formed in April 1994. Now there is not a single area in the country without a militia group of some kind or another.

Clinton will win the election because he has a 43% Bill Clinton majority, which has never given him less than 38% support. This Clinton majority likes the goodies which big government provides and will be sucking on the tit long after the sow dies.

BoobDolt has a George Bush minority of 37%. They are no morally no different than the Bill Clinton majority, but they consider themselves better. They too, will be sucking on the dead hog and can be counted on to do nothing more than blame the Clinton faction for draining the hog.

The remainder of the 20% this year will split down pretty evenly (5%/5%) for Dolt/Clinton, with the 10 % remainder voting for the Perot, Libertarian, Taxpayers and 267 independent candidates.

So in the face of this reality, us saying we will campaign for any Presidential candidate is equivalent to horseflies strapping on a 2 mm dildo and announcing a plan of rape upon an elephant. Might be fun. Keeps us amused. It accomplishes nothing. Reality, like s#^t, just happens.

The reason Jeff got it right is because he has a revolutionary's sense of timing. Things are going to have to get a whole lot worse before it will get better. Yes, Homer Simpson is getting a tad concerned. But not enough to change.

This whole country is waiting to see what happens. What will the election bring? Once they figure out that it brings continuing social decay, corruption, injustice, financial collapse and the end of all hope unless something -- anything is done, then our time will come.

Are we ready for it?

Tactically, Helen Johnson with her plan for infiltrating Democrat/Republican local political committees was somewhat correct. Somewhat incorrect in that infiltrating the two major parties is usually a waste of time.

I have a friend who is in the local Republican county committee. He describes it as being in a geriatrics ward with the geezers manipulated by the up & coming establishment politicians.

There is usually no room for a determined patriot in the DemoPublican organization. They already have their established bureaucracies.

Of course, if you are determined enough, you can infiltrate the weaker of the two Parties. But getting something done is like trying to pick up an anvil with the end of a 100 ft. pole. Very unwieldy.

So are you shut out? No. Never before has there been so many 3rd Parties being formed. Today I heard that the Greens are nominating Ralph Nader to be President. All these third parties . . . Libertarian, U.S. Taxpayers, Reform, Green . . . all of them with a presidential candidate but no effective grass-roots organization. All with a head with a mouth, a Presidential candidate, but no arms, legs, or body to committ action.

Right now, if you wanted to run for a state legislator or county sheriff's position, you would have a clear shot. Add to that a determination to build a county political committee and they will pretty well let you have a free hand (except for the Reform bunch, as it is a bought and paid for deal with them.) In fact, the new third parties can't keep you out as they don't have enough organization

to ride herd. It's like staking land in Oklahoma territory. Read their platform and speak the tongue and you'll get along just fine.

For example, today I'll be re-forming a Newton County Libertarian County Committee. I ran for precinct committeeman and I had friends run for other positions. I'll get re-elected County Chairman and State Senatorial District Chairman and State Committeeman and give the Missouri Libertarian Party "Establishment" fits.

At the same time, I'll broach the subject of forming a mirror U.S. Taxpayers County Committee and then do it. Work out ties with the Perot people to form a "Patriot" coalition.

By fathering these ties with local 3rd parties, while they are young, you not only get into position for political warfare, you get to have a first crack at recruiting and forming "patriot" talent. Appropriating the key brains, talent, and drive of political parties strengthens your hand while it denies them to the enemy. Stick the pro-government side with the mediocracies and weaklings.

Also, it is not too late to file as a candidate for public office with one of these third parties. In addition to lacking organization, they lack candidates. They don't have full slates and are willing to take most anyone on.

If need be, you might have to file a lawsuit to run, but since the U.S. and most state constitutions define candidate qualifications in terms of age and residency, you should win the lawsuit if your third party agrees to your running. Since the U.S. Taxpayers and Reform Parties are new on the ballot in most if not all states, maybe you won't even have to file a lawsuit.

If you are a politically oriented militiaman, running for public office, then trashing the local corrupt sheriff or other politician should be a natural. Take it from me, you can say a lot of mean things when you have the bully soapbox of a political campaign. You don't have to win. Just make sure the local skunk loses. (I've politically terrorized a number of the local politicians with threats about what I'll say about them on the campaign trail. It's fun.)

Sometimes I think Bob Starr should run for office while in jail and pull a Bobby Sands on the system. (Mr. Sands, an IRA member, was elected to the British Parliament from his Catholic area of Northern Ireland when he went on a hunger strike and starved himself to death in 1981.) Can you imagine the legitimacy he could bleed out of the system?

All of the above are my ideas of what constitutes effective political warfare. Unlike most ideas which are tossed out, I intend to and have used them. Sometimes successfully, sometimes not. All ideas are nothing more than hot air unless implemented.

.

Political Guerrilla Warfare

What, a week or so until election and you have nothing to do but cast a vote or two for local, state or federal sleezeballs? Faced with nothing to do except choose betwy anti-government groups dedicated to the pre rascals on the ballot for a particular position?

Nonsense. Like John Paul Jones, you have just begun to fight in the mud-pits of political activity. Once you have faced up to the fact that you won't win or get anyone decent elected, the next thing to figure that if you can't win,

nobody else gets to win either -- especially if they're swine. Just because your political life has been made miserable, this doesn't keep you from spreading the misery around.

Let's say you don't like the local _____ (Sheriff, County Prosecutor, Circuit Judge, KongressKritter -- fill in the moral leper) and you've figured out he's going to win. But you don't want him to win. You want him to sweat a bit. So you decide to run for public office.

Then you are free to dig up all the dirt you want and then start slinging it. He's a public figure running for political office. People expect meanness and mud-slinging in a political campaign. Let's not disappoint them.

I don't care if the local crook has the reputation of being King Arthur. While, like a leopard, you should concentrate your activity on the morally halt, lame and weak first, twenty percent or more of the population is always pissed, even against honest politicians. If it is a three way race, you can expect to get 4 or 5 percent of the votes even if you don't do anything. But you want to do something, don't you?

"But Martin, it's too late to file and get my name on the ballot," you may whine from the comfort of your easy chair. Of course it is too late to get your name on the ballot. This is why you run as a write-in candidate. You weren't gonna win anyway. It doesn't even matter if it is supposedly too late to get the votes for you counted as a write-in. The trick is to get standing to trash the local sleezeball. Once you are a political candidate you can then indulge in negative campaigning, become a one-man mudstorm, free from any lawsuits for slander, libel or defamation of a public figure. Watch the worm squirm as he tries to figure out whether he should answer your attacks and give you attention or just take the hail of abuse.

Also, for those of you who are facing trumped-up charges for pulling some stupid militia pet tricks, the fact that you are running against your accuser means that you can now claim that the charges are politically motivated and drag in some more dirt.

After the election, you just know your candidacy failed because the election was stacked. Yes, you only got 10 votes out of ten thousand cast because the local political hacks 'stole' the election. They used computerized voting. Votescam! Yep, it happens in White-Trash County all the time. You demand a recount! File a local lawsuit to get to look at the ballots. If you are refused, then it was because they are trying to cover something up. If you get to look at the ballots, then either charge that they were changed or admit that while you lost, a number of irregularities cropped up and go from there. This way the election always will lack legitimacy and you can create a whispering campaign against the political hack and make sure he never fully enjoys his electoral victory.

Most county election boards are highly incestuous, favoring one major political party with the other major political party long since resigned, like cut dogs, to sometimes scrounging for the crumbs, propping up some loser to take the fall. Some of these county election boards even have relatives counting the votes for other relatives running for political office, a distinct conflict of interest which is seldom remarked upon. Well, now that you are a political candidate, you get to remark on it and you just won't let that little nugget go, now will you?

The 'election laws' in most states are never really election laws in the sense of ensuring free, fair, open, honest elections. Instead they are candidate disqualification laws created by self-serving politicians making sure they never have to face competition. You get around that by filing as a candidate, then when they kick you off the ballot, you have standing to file a lawsuit. Yes, you will be jacked around by the self-serving state courts, but in the meantime you get your name in the paper as fighting against the local political machine, lying lawyers, corrupt judges, and your crooked, cowardly opponent who voted in these 'election laws' to protect his political monopoly.

If the 'election law' is blatant enough in the sense of being a candidate disqualification law, a federal lawsuit alleging violation of the Voting Rights Acts, Title 42 Section 1983 deprivation of civil rights, maybe even a RICO action may be in order. In any case, if a special election must be held at government expense, then even if you lose again, the winning El Sleezo will still have to campaign with a question mark on his record forever more.

.

Here is a good alternative: Say the local or state courts won't let you on the ballot. Don't get mad, get even. Kick a bunch of these legal weasels off the ballot instead.

Most state constitutions have a vermiform appendix "separation of powers" clause, wherein the legislative, executive, and judicial branches are to be kept separate. Find out all the lawyers who are running for the general assembly or executive office. Then, because lawyers are usually held to be "officers of the court," use that provision to file a lawsuit barring them from running for any legislative office and every executive office except attorney general unless they permanently turn in their license to practice law.

Will you lose? What do you think? Your case will be judged by unsuccessful politicians and lawyers who know politicians who appointed them to the bench. Of course you will lose. However, most people loathe lawyers. If your opponent is a lawyer so much more the better. Point out to the people how the lawyers stole a third of the government branches, the judicial, from the people. Now they want to parasite off the rest of the government branches as well.

If the judge is up for re-election who ruled against you, so much more the better. You can slime him so bad that he will never be able to join polite society again.

The judge under the "Missouri plan" wherein the governor appoints judges and the people vote to retain them? Well, use this to make sure that most people vote "NO" to retain that benchwarmer. The judge thinks he's a god on Olympus while in his courtroom, and so he is. Make him shit-encrusted mortal when he has to come down to political earth. He won't be able to fight back in kind as he has to maintain 'the integrity of the bench,' whatever the hell that means.

If a judge loses a judgeship due to political revolt, usually he has to genteelly starve on the outskirts of the legal community, a pariah and a figure of derision among the up-and-coming attack weasels. Finish one or two judge's political careers, Cross the T, Fire for Effect, and the rest will scramble for cover.

Even if you are unsuccessful in finishing off a judge, then if you ever draw that particular skunk make him recuse himself from hearing your case. If he insists on hearing it, then you have a whole lot more sand to throw into the judicial gear-works.

.

All this should be a starting point for ideas on how to wage successful political guerrilla warfare. The objective when you are too weak to get elected is not to take the possibility of getting to govern seriously. It is to make sure that the opposition cannot effectively govern either in the face of the resistance you generated.

Even if you have solutions to the current problems of runaway entitlements, the national debt, government corruption, whatever, rest assured you will not be allowed to serve in office until after the current problems have collapsed the social order. You will always be justly regarded as a nut case, a radical, a revolutionary or a trouble-maker under current conditions while everyone in the mainstream gets a welfare check of some sort or another. Bismarck and Churchill were intelligent voices crying in the wilderness before they came to power, and the only reason they came to power is that the absolute moral and social bankruptcy of the current 'solutions' and government engendered a collapse too great to ignore.

.

Concentrate on building your power bases. But work on destroying the current political order first. Mao said the guerrilla fighter is a fish who swims in the ocean of the peasantry. The political guerrilla fighter is a fish who blows up political dikes to create an ocean for himself and his fellow fish to swim in.

Remember how war is the continuation of politics by other means? Politics is the continuation of war by using the means at your disposal. Now go out and practice total war and total politics.

--Martin Lindstedt [Write-In Candidate for Sheriff of Newton County](http://www.mo-net.com/~mlindste/index.html) For a closer look at examples of political warfare, check out my WWW page, Patrick Henry On-Line, Lindstedt for Sheriff subpage at URL: <http://www.mo-net.com/~mlindste/index.html>

The Third "Continental" Congress

Militia members to meet in Missouri

The Associated Press

MUSKEGON, Mich. -- The deposed founder of the Michigan Militia plans to hold a "Third Continental Congress" to be ready to take over the country in the event the government collapses.

Norman Olson said he hopes the three-day meeting in Missouri this month will draw representatives from paramilitary groups across the United States.

"(Our) Congress will meet to discuss the crisis in America being caused by the present government, which patriots generally agree is corrupt and out of control," Olson said in a prepared statement.

"The goal of the Congress is to find solutions without having to go to war," he said. "Millions of people are being tyrannized and oppressed by the federal government."

One of the options the group plans to discuss includes the formation of "Continental Army under a Congressional Committee for Safety," Olson said.

Scott Woodring of Newaygo County, a member of the Michigan Militia, said he plans to attend the Oct. 28 meeting in Harrison, Mo.

Woodring earlier this year ran for the post of Dayton Township supervisor in rural Newaygo County on an anti-government platform modeled after the Freemen of Montana. He took about 10 percent of the Aug. 6 primary vote.

"We're going to meet and discuss what issues are most important to the nation as a whole and attempt to reach a consensus," Woodring said. "If we do, we'll formally petition the president and Congress to redress the issues."

Militia members in other states have run into legal trouble for trying to set up their own judicial and banking systems. Woodring earlier this year ran a newspaper ad promoting the "Committee for a De Jure Township."

The ad said that the purpose of the meeting was to talk about organizing the township for "judicial and other purposes."

Angela Moore, office administrator for the Newaygo County Prosecutor's office, said her staff received numerous calls from Dayton Township residents worried about Woodring's organizing.

But neither Woodring nor other freeman types in the county are breaking any laws.

"They've made themselves known, but they've done nothing illegal or dangerous," Moore said.

But if any militia organization tries to set up its own "justice system," authorities say they will step in.

"We're hearing from these people more and more," Moore said. "They're not breaking any laws, but they're annoying."

Page 1C --Four States Section.

Monday, October 14, 1996

The Joplin Globe

.

.

At 01:15 PM 10/3/96 -0400, you wrote:

----- Forwarded message -----

Date: Wed, 2 Oct 1996 17:30:30 -0400 (EDT)

From: Ray Southwell

To: Ray Southwell

Subject: Goals

TO: All Third Continental Congress Delegates, Contacts and interested parties

FROM: Ray Southwell, Michigan Delegate

SUBJECT: GOALS OF THE THIRD CONTINENTAL CONGRESS

DATE: October 2, 1996

Please re-post to all concerned citizens

The time has come to develop an agenda and goals, for the Third Continental Congress. This subject is open for discussion. I believe we must have our goals worked out and be prepared to vote on them, on October 29, 1996. On that first day, we will need to elect a parliamentarian and chairperson. In an effort to sense the feeling of the delegates, the day should be left open for delegates, to voice their ideas. All delegates will have equal time to express their thoughts.

In the recent past, many organizations have developed lofty goals. Most of their goals had one thing in common, they could only be accomplished, if politicians approved of them. For this reason, the Third Continental Congress goals must be attainable, without politician approval. Our goals also must be attainable without WAR. Our goals (outcomes) must be measurable, attainable, broadly based and supported by reason or reasons of importance. Once goals are set, all official discussion should and must revolve around ways to accomplish those goals. We must remember our time is limited. Our energy must be spent in constructive ways. All of us understand how much evil there is, in the current system. We should not waste our time telling each other, how corrupt things are. Now we must unite and come up with goals to protect the people and republic. Once our goals(outcomes) are in place, then we, with the input of all concerned, will make the plans to attain these goals. This Congress would accomplish much, if we can agree on the goals and start committees to discuss methods for achieving these objectives. After going home, we will continue to develop and implement the plans to meet our goals.

These are the goals I have come up with. They are not in order of importance.

- 1) Restore "JUSTICE FOR ALL" within the Nation (5th 6th 7th & 9th Amendments)

- a. We all can agree that the current judicial system lacks what it takes to be considered just to all
- 2)Unification of all citizens who are aware of the corruption in this nation and want to do something about it. (Bill of Rights. WE THE PEOPLE)
 - a. Our numbers are in the millions, but without unification our Republic is lost. Anarchy will prevail and martial law will follow.
- 3)Protection of all people willing to stand against the corrupt. (2nd, 4th & 9th Amendments)
 - a. Currently, the average person is frightened of speaking out or standing up. WE THE PEOPLE feel threatened and isolated. A plan must be developed to protect people, who stand, from the corrupt and tyrannical government.
- 4)Documentation of "WE THE PEOPLE" efforts to stop the corruption, prevent anarchy and Civil War.(1st & 9th Amendments)
 - a. History must record our attempts for a peaceful restoration to our Constitutional Republic.
- 5)Establish a provisional Government using our Constitution as the foundation. (Declaration of Independence and Bill of Rights)
 - a. The current system cannot last much longer. The corruption has become so severe, like Rome, this Nation is about to collapse under the weight of its own corruption.

My original thought of restoring the Constitution is not attainable without WAR. Other organizations have attempted this monumental task. There are only three ways to accomplish restoration of the Constitution, first begging and pleading with the current politicians, (much has been attempted) second, buying the politicians and/or the election process (we then become as corrupt as those buying the politicians today) and third, going to war to take this country back. This cannot be an option. If war must come, the corrupt must start it, not us.

In conclusion, all goals (outcomes) must be attainable without politician approval and WITHOUT STARTING WAR. Our goals must be measurable and broad in base. Once our goals have been established, the real work begins. We will need to develop plans, to accomplish all of the goals, set forth. These plans can and will be evaluated on some ongoing bases. Adjustments will be made, according to the need and desire of the Continental Congress of we the people. Contact Ray Southwell with your thoughts at 616-529-6646 or email at rsout@sunny.ncmc.cc.mi.us

Dear Ray:

Thanks for the invitation to give input into the 3rd Continental Congress. I will take you up on your invitation and put in my observations and make suggestions.

First of all, let me say I see the use for political purposes BEFORE the November 5, 1996 election. While I don't see quite the same exact purposes as you see, it should indeed take place -- if for no other reason than to join together by increasing ties a strong interactive net of open activists and an informational source to be used anonymously by the underground Resistance. Much like the Gadsden Rally enabled Southeastern U.S. militia organizations, this meeting in the central U.S. can be used to do the same for the Mid-West organizations.

The first question I have is what is the time-schedule for this 3CC? Is October 29 (a Tuesday) the first or last day of the 3CC?

Is it one day long? I've gone back over my e-mail and I couldn't find a date other than Oct. 29th mentioned.

Where is this meeting to be held in Independence Missouri?

I note that Michigan is sending 5 delegates. How is delegation representation decided? Is it to be decided by Congressional representation, or does each state get 5 delegates? Some states, like Missouri and Kansas will have a lot of people there. The far-off states will have far fewer people attending.

Will the Missouri 51st Militia out of Kansas City be involved?

Who will be the Presiding Officer? I think it would be far better to have one appointed well before the 3CC, rather than hope that the delegates will elect the person the organizers want elected. Before I formed a Newton County Libertarian Party Central Committee I made sure that I would get re-elected Chairman by counting noses and making sure my supporters were present. While there was no danger of adverse results, still, getting things done politically seldom happens by accident.

Since you and Norman Olson are the primary movers behind this, and will take most, if not all, the praise or the blame for its success or failure, perhaps you had better let it be known who you would like to have elected Presiding Officer in advance.

While we all agree that the prime problem facing this nation is the government is government's refusal to obey the law, especially Constitutional law and social contracts, how will the 3rd Continental Congress make them obey? I've been to a number of these patriot meetings and the question always asked but never fully answered is one of how to enforce of our decrees upon the government. How will we go about forcing government to obey the law when they don't obey their own law now?

For my part, I suggest that you announce that this meeting is to be an overture to electing a 3rd Continental Congress, not a formation, or governing body in and of itself. If it fails for lack of interest, what will you do? Call for a 4th Continental Congress?

I think it is far better to announce limited objectives which can be met, and allows the exploitation of any targets of opportunity. Besides, I sense that the time is not quite right and we lack the strength to carry off a 3rd Continental Congress -- yet. Far better to do our John the Baptist routine for a few more months.

Let the Oct. 29th meeting be known as a precursor of a Provisional Revolutionary Government. This will allow us to proclaim a success upon limited goals, rather than have failure defined upon us by unfriendly others pointing out how well we achieved impossibilities.

Since this meeting will be attended by the hard-core open Resistance leaders, I propose that we allow ten minute speeches by the Presiding Officer and 5 minutes apiece by the Delegates stating what they hope to get accomplished. Why? Because it is essential that we see what the Delegates want to get accomplished. Getting all us ego-maniacs a chance to have our say ensures that everyone will rest assured that they got their chance in the sun and rewards the speakers who are able to get exactly what they intend to accomplish written down and rehearsed into a five-minute span of time, thus rewarding cogency and conciseness whenever possible. Third, it can play well to media videocameras and our own media sources. I'd rather listen to JJ Johnson (one of the few of us who knows the use and exploitation of oratory) than listen to some mainstream politician blather on and on. Other people might like listening to right-wing entertainment as well.

Besides, if everyone is not going to be a delegate, why not keep the ones who do attend without a say entertained at the meeting? You

don't want to lose your audience do you?

What we want to curtail is having this meeting degenerate into a BS session concerning black helicopters or aliens or conspiracy theories. I have seen exactly the same thing happen at quarterly state-wide militia meetings -- back when we had them. I recommended that such talk be reserved for monthly meetings -- after business is done. Such talk has its place -- but not at this "national" meeting.

Which brings us to the question of whether this is an open meeting or whether admission is going to be charged.

I prefer either an open meeting free of charge, or, even better, one which charges maybe \$5 per day in order to defray expenses. But none of this \$20 or 50 bucks admission, which automatically discourages non-rich members.

The Gadsden Minuteman Rally of last May was deemed successful by those who attended, even though it never was proclaimed as anything more than a gloat-fest commemorating political embarrassment caused by catching BATF and other gubbnmint-enFORCERs acting like fascist pigs in their native habitat. A good deal of money was collected for the Bob Starr defense. Judging from the looks of horrified fascination from media-vultures taping the events, I would say that the enemy thought the Rally was a success as well. Everyone got to meet in person people who they knew via e-mail or political declaration. Personal links of friendship and trust were formed.

Success achieved from gaining limited objectives. Let's consider doing what works first.

Now here are some proposals I would like to implement, either on my own or with the help of others: VideoTaping and E-Mail Linkages. They come from an e-mail sent out to a militia friend:

I propose that we videotape the proceedings, so everyone in the Patriot movement will get to visually meet the movers and shakers. Could we use your videocamera and have you act as a camera-man? From what I could tell, you were the only one smart enough to bring his videocamera and get the speakers at the Gadsden Rally. I ended up sending out 5 or 6 videos out all over the country from the master tape you loaned me.

Secondly, I propose an e-mail linkage every 1/2 hour -- at least to start -- updating people who could not afford to show up or cannot due to the needs to work. This e-mail uplink would be used to keep people informed about what is happening on the floor, and could even be used as a mechanism to allow non-present delegates a chance to vote or to join into the debate.

I will bring up my own Juno account or we could open up a new account specifically for this and/or use it in conjunction with an e-mail account of a local Patriot using a local access telephone connection.

The e-mail traffic thus generated could be not only be used as as the equivalent of cheap teleconferencing, it would also be used as a written (thus historical) record. The e-mail could be transcribed as a ASCII .txt file and sent by floppy, along with the videocassette. And it could in turn be used to be placed up upon a friendly WWW site to be accessed by every one with an interest.

I am talking about not only making history, but making sure we are THE original historical source, and making obvious -- and forestalling -- any attempt towards "revision" by unfriendly media and "historians" like Dr. Markkk Pitcavage, The Anti-Militia Pro-Gubbnmint CutLapDog.

Since you have a portable computer with modem and a home station, the use of these items would be invaluable, both in the work at

Independence and at your house in putting up the WWW page.

. . . What I see as indispensible is the creation of e-mail links between the Patriots already out in the open and the political care and feeding via WWW pages for the patriots still in cover. The more notoriety we open Patriots have with the general public and the more affection we hold in the hearts of the underground, the less likely it is that the government will be able to silently round up the above-ground of us. The government will have to weigh the down side of showing its true face to the general public and worry about whether imposing martial rule can be successfully carried out against resistance.

Strong e-mail links can be secured via encryption. A patriot net can be formed inexpensively using cheap computer equipment.

WWW Internet pages go everywhere.

Doing both gives us the twin political advantages of having a network of strong points joined by a web of communication and diffusion of targets necessary to a successful resistance movement.

Let's build them now.

--Martin Lindstedt, militiaman,
7th Missouri Militia

As this article goes on the wire:

I called the Missouri delegation head on Saturday, October 26 and received the following answers:

The place of meeting has been changed to the Holiday Inn of Grandview, Missouri on October 29, 30, 31.

This meeting is only open to 5 delegates per state. Each delegate can bring up to 3 security personnel.

While the head of the Missouri delegation said that she wanted this meeting to be open to the public, it was decided by the organizers to keep this Third Continental Congress closed to the public. It is in effect a closed, private meeting.

From what I understand, there will not be any e-mail or video communications to the at large Patriot community:

"The Delegation may call upon your expertise to help establish email communication. We will make that decision after the meeting this month. We already will have two cameras recording the congress. Thank you, for volunteering your equipment. . . ."

I had a number of tart things to say about the advisability of calling a "Continental Congress," limiting it to only a few chosen delegates, cut off from any possibility of communication and aborting consensus with the Patriot community outside this Congress. I have decided to leave them unsaid and let those people who find value in this process proceed alone.

--Martin Lindstedt

End -- Modern Militiaman, Issue #3.
October, Pre-Election Issue

.

.

This issue can be found at [Patrick Henry On-Line](#)

Back to [Index](#)?

.